

4224. e. 44

A
Sovereign Antidote
AGAINST
ARIAN POYSON:
OR, THE
DIVINITY
OF
Our Blessed Saviour

Asserted and plainly prov'd

From the Old and New Testament, the Writings of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and many other holy Men and learned Doctors, The Divinity of our Blessed Saviour; That he is GOD Coeternal with the FATHER, and that by him and through him the Heavens and Earth and all Things were Created.

In full Answer to Dr Clarke, Mr Whiston, Mr Emlyn and the rest of their Adherents.

By JAMES ABBADIE, D. D. The celebrated
Author of the Defence of the Christian Religion.

London, Printed for J. Booth, on Tower-Hill, overagainst the
Transport Office; and Tho. Bickerton, at the Crown in Patern-
oster-Row. 1719. Price Five Shillings.

A

Sovereign Antidote

AGAINST

ARIAN POISON.

OR, THE

DIVINITY



Our Blessed Saviour.

As it is and should be.

From the Old and New Testament, the Writings of the
Fathers of the Primitive Church, and many other
holy Men and learned Doctors, The Divinity of
our Blessed Saviour. That he is GOD, Coeternal
with the FATHER, and that by him and
through him the Heavens and Earth and all Things
were Created.

In full Answer to Dr Clarke, Mr. Wigan, Mr. Wainwright,
and the rest of their Arguments.

JAMES ARBUTHNOT, D.D. The celebrated
Author of the *Discourses of the Christian Religion*.

London: Printed for J. Bate, on T. New-Bell, overlooking the
River, in 1741. and The Stationer, in the Strand, in 1742.
M.DCCXLII.

A
T R E A T I S E
Concerning the
D I V I N I T Y
O F O U R
Lord J E S U S C H R I S T.

THE Essential Truths of RELIGION are so closely linkt together, that upon that Account they are like the Principles of *Geometry*; some of which serve as so many Steps to descend by, to the Knowledge of the rest.

Thus, in our Examination of the Principal Proofs, upon which the Foundations of our Faith are establish'd, we were led by the Truth of the *Existence of God*, to That of *Natural Religion*; by the Truth of *Natural Religion*, to the Knowledge of the *Jewish Religion*; and by the *Jewish Religion*, to the Truth of the *Christian Religion*: And all this in a Train of so just Consequences, that one wou'd think they cannot be contested, without renouncing at the same time the purest Light of Nature.

The mutual Relation which these Grand Truths have one to another, hath led us a little farther still. We could not examine carefully

B the

A Treatise concerning the

the Foundations on which the Truth of the *Christian* Religion is establish'd, without convincing our selves, that those same Principles do establish the *Divinity* of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, in such a manner, that he who doubts whether *Jesus Christ* be God, the most High God, ought also to doubt of the Truth of the Oracles which establish the *Christian Doctrine*; and that he, who assures himself that these Oracles are true, does no longer doubt of the *Divinity* of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And this is the General Design of this Treatise.

But for the better understanding it, there is One Distinction, highly necessary in these Matters, must be first made. The *Divinity* of *Jesus Christ* may be consider'd, either as a *Mystery* that is *Hid* from us, or as a Truth that has been *Revealed* to us. In the first respect, It is an Incomprehensible Doctrine, and we ought not to endeavour to explain it; but we ought to shew that it is Inexplicable.

All the difference between the *People* and their *Teachers* in this respect, is, that the Ignorance of them both being equal, the *Peoples* Ignorance is a modest and an honest Ignorance, that is not ashamed to be blind as to what it hath pleased God to hide from them; whereas the Ignorance of their *Teachers* is a Haughty and an Artificial Ignorance, such as has recourse to the Distinctions of the *School*, and abstracted Speculations, for fear of confounding it self with That of the *People*.

We do not undertake here to *Explain* the *Mystery*, but to prove the *Truth* of it. We shall have no recourse to any *Humane* Speculations, to shew *HOW* the Thing is, but we shall shew, by Proofs taken from *Revelation*, *THAT* it is effectually. Inasmuch as this is a Truth *Reveal'd*.

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

3

veal'd, it is clearly and distinctly contained in Scripture.

Finally, As my Design is to shew the Essential Dependance there is between the Divinity of Jesus Christ and the Truth of the Christian Religion in General, I shall make it my principal Endeavour to shew that, either they must be both Sav'd, or both Lost, in one common Ship-wreck : And in this View I shall make use of a Method that may seem a little new and extraordinary, but such as will, perhaps, be convincing to the Mind.

For, *first*, I shall shew, that if Jesus Christ were not True God of one and the same Essence with his Father, the *Mahometan* Religion would be preferable to the Christian Religion, and Jesus Christ inferiour to *Mahomet*. I shall shew, *secondly*, That if Jesus Christ were not the True God in this Sence, the *Sanhedrim* had done an Act of Justice in putting him to death ; or at least the Jews had done well to hold to this Opinion, and reject the Preaching of the Apostles, when These propos'd to 'em to believe in Him crucified. It shall be shew'd, *thirdly*, That if Jesus Christ be not the True God, Jesus Christ and the Apostles have engaged us in Errour ; and 'tis They, not We, that are guilty of this Seduction. In the *fourth* place, it shall be shew'd, That if Jesus Christ be not of one and the same Essence with his Father, there is no manner of Agreement between the Old and New Testament ; and that the Prophets and Apostles were Inspir'd by a Spirit of Contradiction and Lying. *Last*ly, it shall be shew'd, That if Jesus Christ be not the Most High God, we cannot distinguish Religion from Superstition and Idolatry ; That we ought to take it for a *Farce*, design'd to deceive

A Treatise concerning the

Mankind; and also (if it may be said without Blasphemy) that there won't be Characters enough in Religion to distinguish it from *Magick*. For all which we design Five Different Sections, to divide this Work with the Sixth and Last, which is design'd to answer some Objections made against the *Orthodox Faith*; and to find out some ways of satisfying our selves about the Difficulties and Obscurities of this Grand Mystery.

In the mean time, it will be proper here to give the Reader some Advice, which we think here very important. The first is, that the Divinity of Jesus Christ, the *Incarnation*, and the *Trinity*, being Three such Objects as may be treated of with some distinction, we propose here to establish but the *first*, which we look upon as most known, and, in some sort, Fundamental in respect to the rest.

The Second is, That we shall make no scruple to use the Term of *Supreme God*, in speaking of Jesus Christ, although this Term (to take it rigorously) be a Pagan Expression, and seems to denote some Opposition between the *Supreme God* and *Subordinate Divinities*. It sufficeth to take away the Ambiguity, by declaring, That we do thereby understand *Him*, who is partaker of this Glorious and Supreme Essence and Divinity, whereunto all things are obedient.

The Third is, that the Brevity we aim at in this Work, having not permitted us to dispose the Adversaries of the Orthodox Doctrine into several different *Classes*, and to engage severally the *Arrians*, *Demi-Arrians* and *Socinians*, we have so regulated our selves in the Conduct of this Work, that they are, almost every where, engag'd by the same Proofs.

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

5

In the next place, I desire that what I say of the *Person* of our Adversaries, may be distinguished from what I am to say of their *Cause*. I have for the former all the Sentiments of Love and Compassion that I owe to my strayed Brethren; I admire the Great and Wonderful Gifts which God has given to some amongst them. And although they do manifest Violence to the Scripture, I would not willingly accuse them of speaking against their own Sentiment, nor judge them unworthy of the charitable Assistance their Persons meet with in some Protestant States.

As to what regards their *Cause*, it cannot be ill taken if I endeavour to make it appear in all the Deformity that can give the greatest Horrour for such Sentiments as we believe incompatible with the Spirit of the True Religion. This is my Duty, and the End of my Ministry. I ought not to forget any thing I can think capable to fetch back those that are straying, and to keep the rest from it.

But we do not design to make use of Hyperbolic and Declamatory Expressions, to give a hideous Description of a Disguis'd Doctrine. We shall only make use of such Proofs as are propos'd, after a plain manner, and have no recourse but to the Severity of Right Reason, whether to convince our Selves, or to convince Others. May it please Almighty God to enlighten and direct us by his Holy Spirit, to the end that this Work may redound to his own Glory, and the Eternal Salvation of our Souls. Amen.

B 3

LECT.

S E C T. I.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, That if Jesus Christ be not True God of One and the Same Essence with his Father, the Mahometan Religion is preferable to the Christian Religion, and Jesus Christ inferiour to Mahomet.

C H A P. I.

That if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, the Christianity we profess is the Corruption of the Christian Religion, and Mahometism is the Re-establishment of it.

IT is a Principle of Natural Religion, which is more ancient than all other Religions, that there is an Infinite Distance between the Creator and the Creature: For which Reason God cannot, without great Impiety, be brought down to the Creature; nor can the Creature, without monstrous Idolatry, be lifted up to God. If then Jesus Christ be the Creator, the Supreme God, He cannot be said, without great Impiety, to be but a meer Creature. And if Jesus Christ be but a meer Creature, He cannot, without

mon-

monstrous Idolatry, be acknowledged for the Supreme God. So that if we are mistaken in the Opinion we have conceiv'd that Jesus Christ is of one and the same Essence with his Father, and that he is by consequence the Supreme God, I don't see how we can avoid being real Idolaters, since it is in this Quality that we worship him.

It will be to no purpose to say here, for our Justification, that we sincerely believe Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God; that indeed there is an Error in our Mind, but no Infidelity in our Heart, since in the main our Worship is directed to the Supreme God alone. The same Reason might serve to excuse all Idolatries past, present, and possible. The Heathens who worshipt their *Jupiter*, did really believe him to be the Supreme God; and their Acts of Worship were intentionally referr'd to the Supreme Being: And yet they were not less Idolatrous on that Account.

Neither must we imagine, that a Creature for its being very excellent, can become the Object of Worship, which may not be given to any besides the Supreme God. They that worship the Stars are as much Idolaters as those that worship Wood and Stone: And they that should worship the Angels would be as guilty as those that worship the Stars. Indeed their Idolatry would not be so gross, but it would be as true; because Idolatry does not consist in rendring Divine Honours to a meer Creature, but in rendring them simply to a Creature.

It will be told us, That it may be sometimes lawful to pay Worship to a Creature whom God is pleas'd to invest with his Glory: As it is lawful to pay extraordinary Honour to One, to whom the King orders they should be paid.

A Treatise concerning the

Well and Good ! provided it be granted us, that it is never lawful to worship a Creature as the Supreme God ; no more than 'tis lawful to honour a Subject by acknowledging him for the True King. God in effect could not, and would not in favour of another, part with this incommunicable Character of his Glory. He *could* not : For 'tis impossible that God alone should be the Supreme God, and Another, that has not his Essence, should be so too. He would not : For how could he will a thing, which being contrary to the Truth, is likewise contrary to his Nature ?

Suppose then as much as you please, that Jesus Christ is God's Representative ; that he is his Ambassador ; and that 'tis but as he's God's Representative, that he is a just Object of our Worship : This makes nothing against our Maxim ; which is, That Jesus Christ being not the Supreme God, cannot, without manifest Idolatry, be worshipt as Supreme God. This shall be our First Principle.

The Second is, That Idolatry is a Crime which violates the Law of God, and destroys the Spirit of Piety. In effect, this Crime is opposite to the Two Grand Ends of Religion. It is evidently oppos'd to the Glory of God ; since it bereaves God of his own Glory, to invest the Creature with it : And then, 'tis opposite to our own Salvation, since the Holy Spirit declares, that *Idolaters shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.*

From these Two Principles it follows, That the Christianity we profess, is the Corruption of the Christian Religion, and that *Mahometism* is the Re-establishment of it. For if the Christian Religion in its Purity does not acknowledge Jesus Christ but as a mere Creature, we sub-

vert

vert the Christian Religion, when we worship Jesus Christ as being essentially the Supreme God. And if the Religion of those that worship Jesus Christ as the Supreme Being, is the Corruption of Christianity, it follows, that the *Mahometan* Religion, which places the Supreme God infinitely above Jesus Christ, is in this respect the Re-establishment of it.

Here perhaps it will be said, that the Christi-^{Episcop.}an Religion is not essentially a Science of bare Contemplation, but a Practical Knowledge; and that it rather consists in Obedience than in Abstracted Speculations on the Deity, I grant the Principle: But I maintain, that it cannot be reasonably applied to the Matter in hand. For can we call those Principles Simple Speculations, which are of such importance, that we are Idolaters, or are not Idolaters, according as they are false or true? If Jesus Christ be of one and the same Essence with his Father, or, what returns to the same thing, if Jesus Christ be the Supreme God, he ought to be worshipt in this Quality; and our Adversaries cannot then without the greatest Impiety, refuse to acknowledge him for such, and to honour him under this Name; and if he be not, we cannot confound him with the Supreme God, without being guilty of Idolatry. The Question here is, how to avoid Impiety or Idolatry: And consequently the Questions depending are practical, and such too as are of the highest Importance.

It is therefore to no purpose for *Episcopius* to strive to shew us, that 'tis not essential to Salvation to know whether Jesus Christ be God by Eternal Generation; or whether being but a mere Creature, he be called God by reason of his Ministry. For when he undertakes to shew that these Questions are not Fundamental, by shewing

ing that those who believe Jesus Christ to be a mere Creature, or but a mere Man, may worship him without being guilty of Idolatry; because they worship him, not as he is Man, but as he is God's Representative; he was not sensible that his Proof remained imperfect: Because, to shew that these Questions are not Essential, it is not sufficient to shew, that the *Socinians* may, without being Idolaters, worship him whom they believe to be a mere Man by Nature; but it must be shew'd farther, that we may, without Idolatry, worship Jesus Christ as Supreme God, tho' he be not the Supreme God.

Certainly, if our Belief of the Consubstantiality and Eternal Generation of the Son of God, engages us in Idolatry, there is nothing can be more Essential or more Fundamental than these Questions which respect this Generation and Cons substantiality. Now 'tis certain, that our Doctrine upon this Subject does engage us in Idolatry, if it be true that we are in an Error. For if Jesus Christ be not of one and the same Essence with his Father, he is not the God and the Creator of all things. And if this be so too, we cannot place him on the Throne of the Supreme Being without manifest Idolatry; and also we have no more excuse left us to abate the horror of this Superstition.

For if we say for our Justification, that we worship him as the Supreme Being, because we do in good earnest believe him to be the Supreme Being; the Heathens, as we have already observed, will justify the Worship they render their *Jupiter*, by saying, that they don't worship him as the True God, for any other Reason but because they believe in good earnest that he is the True God.

If we say we are not to be blam'd for worshipping Jesus Christ as the Supreme God; because tho' he be not in effect the Supreme God, he yet deserves our Adoration; we do but change the State of the Question. For the Question here, is not, whether Jesus Christ does deserve our Adoration; but, whether we may adore him as the Supreme God, when he is not the Supreme God in effect.

If we say that we must acknowledge nothing as Essential and truly necessary to Salvation, but what on one side is most clearly contained in Scripture, and on the other, is either commanded us, or prohibited us upon pain of the loss of Eternal Salvation: This very thing serves to condemn us. For what is there more formally contained in Scripture, than the Precept of not attributing to another the Glory of the Supreme God? And what is there prohibited upon more rigorous pains than Idolatry, which sets the Creature in the place of the Creator?

If we should chance to imagine, that the Supreme God will not condemn our Worship, because he assumes to himself all the Honours that are paid his Son; we shall be corrected by being told, that if Jesus Christ be a Creature, he can't be call'd the Son of God but in an improper and remote Sence; and that however it be, if he is a mere Creature, the difference there is between him and the Supreme God, is greater than any can be found between one Creature and another, whatever the disproportion between 'em may be. And that so, if an excellent Creature takes it deservedly ill, that the Homages due to him are transferr'd to a viler Creature; much more will God take it ill, that the Worship which is due to him alone, is render'd to Jesus Christ.

It is said, that Jesus Christ represents the Supreme God. Yes, he does; but to represent the Supreme God, he is not presently the Supreme God. He is the Son of God. Yes, he is so; but he bears that Title in an improper and figurative Sense, which does not hinder but that there may be a greater distance between him and the Supreme God, than there is between the impurest Insect and the most glorious Angel. So that, tho' it were lawful to invest the vilest Creature with the Titles and Glories of the noblest, it would never be lawful to pay unto Jesus Christ the Homages due to the Supreme God alone.

C H A P. II.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, we cannot but look upon Mahomet as a Divine Man.

THUS it appears to us, that the *Mahometan* Religion is at least in some respect the re-establishment of the Christian Religion, if it be true that Jesus Christ is not of One and the Same Essence with the Supreme God. But, because it might be said that That Religion is otherwise full of Fictions and Imposture, we would fain ask, how it is conceivable that Truth and Error can have made so strict an Alliance there? That *Mahomet* is an *Impostor*, is acknowledg'd by every one amongst us: That *Mahomet* has abolisht Idolatry is what must be suppos'd. And thus are matcht together two very opposite Characters. If *Mahomet* has disabus'd the World in point of the Christian Idolatry, (for so I call that Worship which the Chri-

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

13

Christians pay unto Jesus Christ, if he be not the Supreme Being) by what Spirit hath he wrought so Great a Work; by the Spirit of God, or by the Spirit of the Devil? If by the Spirit of the Devil, how has he abolished Idolatry? If by the Spirit of God, how is he an Impostor?

It will, perhaps, be said, that *Mahomet* condemned the Worship of the *Pagan* Idols, and so the same Question might be askt upon this last Article. But, there is a difference between the Principles which *Mahomet* supposes, and the Principles which *Mahomet* has established. *Mahomet* supposes the Knowledge of the True God, and the Destruction of the *Pagan* Idolatry. It was not he, but Jesus Christ who produc'd these two Effects in the World. The True God was known every where for several Ages before him, and the *Pagan* Idolatry was entirely abolished. That was an Effect of the Preaching of the Apostles. And *Mahomet*, by what Spirit of Imposture soever he is conceiv'd to be inspir'd, durst not and could not establish a Religion directly opposite to these Two Principles.

But the Case is not the same with the True Knowledge of Jesus Christ, and the Destruction of the Christian Idolatry. It was *Mahomet* that taught Mankind that the Christians were Idolaters, in Worshipping Jesus Christ as Supreme God. It was his Principal Design to fetch back from their straying those, who under the Name of the Trinity did in effect worship several Gods. For so he speaks in his Alcoran. Jesus Christ then and the Apostles must have been the Reformers of the *Pagan* World, in destroying, by their Preaching, the *Pagan* Idolatry. But *Mahomet* ought to be considered as the Reformer of the Christian World, if it be true that he has destroyed this Christian Idolatry.

As

As then we should be infinitely surpriz'd, if the Apostles had destroyed the *Pagan Idolatry* by preaching of Fables; we should also have Reason to be surpriz'd that *Mahomet* should have abolisht the *Christian Idolatry* by Impostures.

In effect Jesus Christ does in his Gospel declare, that Teachers are known by their Fruits. And this Maxim cannot fail of being True, since it is Truth it self that teaches it us. If we judge of things by this Principle, we cannot but have a very high Opinion of *Mahomet*, and acknowledge him also for a Great Prophet, if it be true that he has taught Mankind not to confound the Supreme God with a Creature. He has inlightned many Nations and many Ages. He has placed God on the Throne of God, and the Creature in the Rank of a Creature. What can be more Lawful and more Holy than such a Design? What can be Nobler and Greater than such a Work? Certainly, if *Mahomet* has inlightned the Universe by dissipating the Darkness of this profound Superstition, we should be in the wrong to dispute with him all those Titles which the *Mussulmans* give him; and we may boldly say, that he ought to be look'd upon as a Teacher of Truth, as a Prophet, as Greater than the Prophets of the Law, as a Greater Prophet than Jesus Christ himself. These are strange and shocking Paradoxes: But yet such as will be certain and evident Truths, in case Jesus Christ be not the Supreme God.

I say, that he is a Teacher of Truth. This cannot be doubted, since he teaches Mankind so *Essential Truths*. This First Element of Religion, *He that is a mere Creature by Nature, ought not to be worshipped as the Supreme God*, is the Foundation of Natural Religion as distinguish'd from Superstition,

perstitution, the Foundation of the Jewish Religion as distinguish'd from the *Pagan* Idolatry, and the Foundation of the Christian Religion considered in its Purity. *Mahomet*, who has establish'd his Religion upon this Grand Principle, is then not only a Teacher of Truth, but also a Teacher who seems to re-establish all Truths, at least the most Essential and most Important to Religion.

But, it will be said, it cannot be deny'd at least, that *Mahomet* aims at the flatering humane Passions, and is rather the Teacher of the Flesh than that of the Spirit. If this be so, we may deservedly wonder that so much Truth is join'd with so much Impurity and Vice. For we know that there is no Communion between Light and Darkness; and so, if *Mahomet* has not acted by the Spirit of God, he has acted by the Spirit of the World; or if he has not acted by the Spirit of the World, he has acted by the Spirit of God. Hereupon, we search for the Characters of each of these two Spirits, in him. We are told, that *Mahomet* is impure in his Morals and Maxims. This Character is that of the Spirit of the World: but 'tis disputed. It appears that *Mahomet* has reform'd Religion by abolishing the Christian Idolatry, and causing to be every where worshipt One God Alone. This here is a Character of the Spirit of God, and renders it unquestionable. It is then more certain on our side that *Mahomet* has the Character of the Spirit of God, than it is that he has the Characters of the Spirit of the World.

If *Mahomet* be an Impostor, tell us how it is possible for an Impostor to promote the Good Pleasure of God, destroy Idolatry and enlighten the Universe? Has God invest'd an Impostor with the greatest Character of his own Prophets, and with the Character of his own Son? For, the
Pro-

Prophets who foretold the coming of the Messiah, did also foretel it as a Character of his coming, that he should destroy Idolatry. Has God made of an Impostor the Instrument of his Mercy, and the Minister of his Glory? What would we think of the Divine Providence, if it had chosen for its Evangelists Devils, who shou'd have appear'd in humane Shape, and have preach't the Gospel? We should have believ'd either that God designed to render the Gospel (as Divine as it is) detestable, by putting it into the Mouth of the Devil; or that God designed to Consecrate the Devil, notwithstanding the Wickedness of his Nature, by making him the Depository of the Gospel. This Comparison, for its being Odious is but the fitter to demonstrate the Truth. For, what we say of the Devil, we may say of the Seducers his Ministers; and there in the Case of *Mahomet*. That if this Man being an Impostor, was chosen by Providence to re-establish the True Religion, Providence must have design'd either to render Religion infamous by causing it to be re-establish'd by an Impostor, or to consecrate the Impostor it self by chusing it to re-establish Religion: Both which are equally Impious and Extravagant.

C H A P.

C H A P. III.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, Mahomet is a Great Prophet, the Greatest of Prophets and indeed every way preferable to Jesus Christ.

BUT let us proceed a little farther, and say, that according to this Supposition, *Mahomet* may be look't upon not only as a Prophet, but as One Greater than all the Prophets of the Old Testament. The Ancient Prophets spake but to the People of *Israel*: but *Mahomet* has spoken to the finest and most considerable part of the Universe. The Prophets succeeded One another, because One alone did not live long enough to instruct the Men of different Ages. *Mahomet* had no need of a Companion, or a Successor to banish Idolatry for ever from those Countries where his Doctrine has been receiv'd. The Ancient Prophets were rais'd up in an Extraord'nary manner to destroy Superstition and Idolatry, by working divers Miracles. *Mahomet* has destroy'd, without one Miracle, an Idolatry spread over the face of the whole Earth. In fine, if *Moses* was honour'd with the Glorious Title of the Friend of God, because God reveal'd to him his Will without any Obscurity and Riddle: the Privilege of *Mahomet* must be much more esteem'd, who not only knew the Will of God himself, but also in a most distinct manner made it known to othes. *Moses* never knew God as he was, Jesus Christ alone has both known him and made him known. But if the Principles of our Adversaries be true, *Mahomet* has made him known

much better than Jesus Christ has done. And this leads us insensibly to shew, that in their *Hypotheses* *Mahomet* ought to be look'd upon as a Greater Prophet than Jesus Christ.

Which must needs be Granted, whether you consider his Doctrine or the Success of his Ministry. If you consider the Success of his Doctrine, the Thing it self speaks. Jesus Christ has made his Gospel be receiv'd throughout the whole world. But he has hardly destroy'd one kind of Superstition, before Mankind relapses into another as Dangerous. and they are no sooner delivered from *Pagan Idolatry*, but they fall into *Christian Idolatry*. *Mahomet* has establisht his Religion upon firmer Foundations; and has taken juster Measures to hinder Idolatry from ever reviving agen, after it has been once destroy'd; since we see that from the time his Religion was first planted, his Disciples have never had any Inclination to this kind of Superstition.

We must not be surpriz'd: the disadvantage which Jesus Christ has in this Comparison, arises (if the Principle of our Adversaries be true) from this, that the Doctrine of *Mahomet* has in it a natural Character, which is more opposite to Idolatry, than is that of Jesus Christ. Let a Man consider well the Language of Jesus Christ, either when he speaks by himself, or when he speak, by the Ministry of his Disciples; and let him compare it with the Language of *Mahomet*; and he'll soon be convinced of it.

John 1. Jesus Christ when he speaks by himself, or by his Servants, will tell you, that *He was before John the Baptist*; that *he was before Abraham was*; that *he had had his Glory with his Father before the World was*; that *he is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last*; that *he was in the beginning*; that *he was with God*; that *he*

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

19

he was God; that all things were made by him; that without him there was not any thing made that was made; that the Worlds were made by him; that all things were created by him; as well those things which are in Heaven, as those which are on Earth; things visible and things invisible, whether they be Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers; that all things were made by him and for him; that he is before all things, and that by him all things subsist. He will tell you, That there is but one Lord, which is Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him; 1 Cor. 8. that 'tis he who hath laid the Foundations of the Earth, and that the Heavens are the Works of his Hands. Hebr. 2.

He is called the Son of God, the Only Son of God, God's Own Son, the Only Issue of the Father, Emanuel, that is to say, God with us; God manifested in the Flesh, and justify'd in the Spirit, the Lord and God; sometime the Saviour and mighty God, the God and Saviour of all the Earth, the Lord our Righteousness.

But, that we mayn't doubt of the Sence, wherein all these Expressions are suitable to Jesus Christ, it is infinitely remarkable, that when he speaks by himself or by his Servants, whom he has instructed and filled with his Spirit, he applies to himself the Oracles of the Prophets which make mention of the Supreme God, and contain the Characters of his most Peculiar and most Incommunicable Glory. It had been said in the Book of the Chronicles, That God alone knoweth the Hearts of the Sons of Men, Jesus Christ does attribute to himself this glorious Title, as a Title which is to draw upon him the Fear and Wonder of all Mankind. And all the Churches shall know, says he, in the Revelation, that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts; and I will give unto every one according to his Works. It was said in Rev. 2. 23

A Treatise concerning the

Esai. 61.

the Law, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, according to the Exposition Jesus Christ gives of it : and the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* informs us, that God said, when he introduc'd his First-born Son into the World, *Let all the Angels worship him.* It was said of the Messiah, by a Prophet : *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me. For the Lord hath anointed me : He hath sent me to preach good Tidings to the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the Captives, and the opening of the Prison, &c. I am the Lord Jehovah, loving Judgment, and hating Robbery for Burnt-offering. I will establish their Work in Truth, and I will make an Everlasting Covenant with them.* This Oracle does Jesus Christ apply to himself in *St. Luke*, Chap. 4. 18. when he says to the Jews, *This Day is this Scripture fulfilled, &c.* The Prophets had spoke of a Voice that should cry in the *Wilderness*, *Prepare the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait.* And *Esaias* foreseeing that Time, exhorts *Sion* to publish good Tidings, to lift up her Voice with Strength, and to say unto the Cities of *Juda*, *Behold your God ; adding immediately after, Behold the Lord will come with Strength, and his Arm shall rule, &c. He shall feed his Flock like a Shepherd, he shall gather the Lambs with his Arm, and carry them in his Bosom, &c.* And then, who hath measured the Waters in the hollow of his Hand ? And meted out Heaven with a Span, and comprehended the Dust of the Earth in a measure, and weighed the Mountains in Scales, and the Hills in a Balance ? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or been his Counsellor, &c ? Behold the Nations are as a drop of Water, and are counted as a small Dust of the Balance. He taketh up the Isles as a very little thing, &c. These are, no doubt, the Characters of the Supreme Being : And yet the Gospel applies them

to Jesus Christ, since *John* the Baptist is this Voice that cryeth in the Wilderness; or it is before Jesus Christ that *John* the Baptist has prepared the way; and a little after, the Messengers of Peace were heard to say unto the Cities of *Juda*, *Behold thy Saviour cometh, Behold your God.* God had said by the Mouth of the Prophet *Esaïas*: *Say* *Esaï.* 35. *unto them that are of a fearful Heart, be strong, fear not. Behold your God will come with Vengeance: God will come with a recompence, and will save you. Then the Eyes of the Blind shall be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame Man leap as a Hart, and the Tongue of the Dumb shall Sing, &c.* Read the ~~10~~ Chapter of *Matthew*, and you'll see, Jesus Christ does visibly apply this Oracle to himself, in the answer he makes the Disciples of St. *John*. He declares himself then to be the God of the *Israelites*, the God that is to comfort them; and also the God of Recompence and Vengeance, the God of their Salvation: Which are all Titles the Supreme God is wont to assume in the antient Oracles. It had been said to God by the Mouth of the Psalmist: *Thou hast in the beginning laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure. They shall all wax Old like a Garment: As a Vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art ever the same, and thy Tears shall have no end.* It cannot be deny'd but all these things are said to the Supreme God, and of the Supreme God, as well as the beginning of the Psalm, which begins thus: *Hear my Prayer, O Lord, and let my cry come unto thee; and these expressions that follow: Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Sion, &c. Then shall the Nations fear the Name of the Lord, and all the Kings of the Earth thy Glory. When the Lord shall have re-built Sion, and shall ap-*

Pf. 102.

pear in his Glory : For he hath looked down from the height of his Sanctuary, from Heaven did the Lord behold the Earth. It is very evident that in this place is meant the Supreme God ; and much more evident that this Oracle is apply'd to Jesus Christ in the 1st Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is to the Supreme God that the Psalmist Addresses himself, when after he had said,

ps. 68.

The Chariots of God are Twenty Thousand, even Thousands of Angels. The Lord is among them in the Holy Place, as in Sinai. He addeth, Thou art ascended on high. Thou hast received Gifts for Men &c. Blessed be God, who daily loadeth us with his Benefits, even the God of our Salvation, Selah. It is the Supreme God here, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that hath Legions of Angels in his disposal, as Jesus Christ himself says ; it is the Blessed God, the God that was ascended up on high in the Ark, which he filled in a particular manner, the God that distributeth his Gifts unto Men ; but it is also Jesus Christ, according to the Application which the Apostle makes of these Passages in the following Terms, which remove all manner of Difficulty in this respect.

Eph. 4. 7.
8. 9.

But unto every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the Gift of Christ. Wherefore, he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led Captivity captive, and gave Gifts unto Men. Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the Earth. These last Words do shew, that it is to Jesus Christ, that this ancient Oracle is apply'd ; and we need but consider the Oracle it self, to see that it manifestly respects the Supreme God.

Zach. 12.
10.

That God would pour upon the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of Grace and of Mercy ; that they should look upon him whom they have pierced

pierced

pierced; that they should mourn for him, as one mourneth for an only Son, and that they should be in bitterness for him, as one is in bitterness for the Death of a First-born. We cannot doubt but it is the Supreme God, that speaks in this Prophecy. We need only hear what the Prophet says, who informs us of it in the very beginning of the Chapter in these Terms: *The Lord which stretcheth forth the Heavens, and layeth the Foundation of the Earth, and formeth the Spirit of Man within him, hath said: Behold I will make Jerusalem, &c. and a little after, without ever changing the Person: I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of Grace and of Mercy; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierc'd, &c.* St. John in his Revelation applies this Oracle to Jesus Christ. Behold, says he, he cometh with Clouds, and every Eye shall see him, and they also which pierc'd him. But if we distrust this Testimony, and think it not clear enough, we must at least acquiesce in that which we read in the 19th Chapter of the Gospel of this Apostle, in these Words: *And again, another Scripture saith, They shall see him whom they have pierc'd.* Thus is the Oracle most certainly understood of the Supreme God; and as certainly does the Evangelist seek the accomplishment of it in Jesus Christ. It is the Supreme God, that the Prophet *Esaias* introduces speaking thus: *I have sworn by my self, the Word is gone out of my Mouth in Righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue shall swear.* I say that he who speaks in this Prophecy is the Supreme God. The Prophet says so expressly in the Verses preceeding. For thus saith the Lord that created the Heavens, I am the Lord that formed the Earth, &c. I am the Lord *Jehovah*, and there is none else,

A Treatise concerning the

&c. and a little after, *Have not I the Lord your God, and there is no God else besides me? &c. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the Earth; for there is none else. I have sworn by my self, &c. that unto me every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue shall give me Glory.* And yet it is certain that St. Paul applies these Passages to Jesus Christ. For, when he had said, *Rom. 14. 10. That we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ*, he addeth: *For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me, and every Tongue shall confess to God.*

C H A P. IV.

Wherein is compar'd the Language of Jesus Christ with that of Mahomet; and 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, Mahomet was more True, more Wise, more Charitable, and more Zealous for the Glory of God than was Jesus Christ.

THUS we have seen how Jesus Christ, speaking either by himself, or by the Mouth of his Disciples, does equalize and confound himself with the most High God; sometimes saying of himself such *Things*, and at other times applying to himself such *Oracles*, as cannot belong to any but to the Supreme Being.

Thus did not Mahomet. He declares in almost every Page of his *Alcoran*, that none but the Eternal Father is God. He calls himself a Prophet, a Man divinely sent: but he will not pass for God. He owns Jesus Christ to be divinely sent: but will not have him be called God.

God, or Son of God. There is not the least Obscurity or Equivocation in his Words. He plainly says, that those who say that the Son of Mary is God, are Unbelievers and Infidels. Christ the Son of Mary is no more than God's Envoy. He says, that the Christians are Infidels, by making Three Gods where there is but One. Nay farther, he represents God complaining to Jesus Christ after this manner: O Jesus, Son of Mary, dost thou persuade Mankind to put thy Mother Mary and Thee in the place of God, and to worship you, as if ye were Gods? To which Jesus makes answer: God forbid I should say any thing contrary to the Truth. Thou knowest whether I have taught that Doctrine or no. Thou knowest the Secrets of all Hearts, &c. He would have Men invoke God the Creator of Heaven and Earth, who made the Light and the Darknes: And he calls those Infidels, who set up another Christ alike and equal to God.

From hence it appears we cannot but conclude, that Mahomet was (according to the Principle of our Adversaries) more True, more Wise, more Charitable, and more Zealous for the Glory of God, than Jesus Christ. These are Conclusions which our Heart abhorreth as full of Blasphemy; and yet our Judgment cannot but receive them as true, if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father.

In this Case I say, Mahomet were more True than Jesus Christ; at least in respect to the Essentials of Religion, and the Glory of the Supreme Being. Which I beleive will have but little Difficulty in it, if we here call to mind all those surprizing Propositions of Jesus Christ when he speaks by himself or by his Disciples, in which he seems to confound himself with the Supreme Being; and then compare

pare them with the Propositions of *Mahomet*, which are contradictory to them.

Jesus Christ says, either by himself, or by his *Evangelist*, that *he was in the Beginning*; and was *God*. *Mahomet* will tell ye, that *Jesus Christ* was not *God*; and was not in the *Beginning*. The Doctrine of *Jesus Christ* is, that all Things were made by him; that without him was not any thing made that was made. That all Things were Created by him, Things Visible and Things Invisible; that by him the World was made, that he made Worlds, lay'd the Foundation of the Earth, and that the Heavens are the Work of his Hands. The Doctrine of *Mahomet* is, that all Things were not made by *Jesus Christ*; that neither the World nor the Worlds were made by him; that he Created neither Things Visible, nor Things Invisible; that he did not lay the Foundation of the Earth, and that the Heavens are not the Work of his Hands. The Evangelists speaking by *Jesus Christ*, and according to his Principles, will tell ye, that *God* has given his Glory unto *Jesus Christ*, and that he who honours the Son, honours the Father. *Mahomet* will maintain to you on the other side, that *God* doth not give his Glory to any; that as it is impossible for any other besides himself to be Supreme God, the Glory of the Supreme Being is an Incommunicable Glory; that 'tis false to say, that He who honours the Son honours the Father; and that on the contrary we do dishonour the Father, when we affect to honour the Son too much. *Jesus Christ* applying to himself the Oracles of the Prophets which speak of the Supreme God, does thereby intitle himself even *Jehovah*, a God loving judgment, and hating iniquity; he who hath measured the waters of the Sea in the Hollow of his hand, and who weigheth the mountains in a balance,

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

27

and scattereth the Isles as small Dust, the Maker, and also the Destroyer of Heaven and Earth; the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End of all Things; the Prince before whose Face John the Baptist was to Go; the Lord that stretcheth forth the Heavens, and layeth the Foundation of the Earth, and that formeth the Spirit of Man within him; who was to send upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of Grace and Mercy, &c. He that swears by himself; before whom every knee is to bend; that calls the Generations from the Beginning; that is alive, and to whom every Tongue is to give Praise; the Lord, the Redeemer, the God of Israel; he that saith, There is no Other God besides me. Who is like unto me? that calls himself the God of Hosts, our Fear and our Terror: the thrice Holy One of Isaiah, whose Glory filleth all the Earth. On the other side Mahomet will tell ye, that all these Titles are just and true, if apply'd to the Supreme God; but they are impious and sacrilegious if apply'd to another, because they do evidently contain the Characters of the most Incommunicable Glory of God. Now these Two Languages cannot be both false and both true, for they are contradictory. One then must be true, and the Other false. That of Mahomet, which saith so expressly, that Jesus Christ is a mere Creature, and ought not to be confounded with the Supreme God, is not false, if Jesus Christ be but a mere Creature indeed. It follows then (which is a dreadful thing to say) that 'tis the Language of Jesus Christ that is void of Truth.

It will be said, that the Expressions of Mahomet are Proper and Literal; whereas those of Jesus Christ are Figurative and Hyperbolical: and so, these two Languages which are Contrary in appearance, and not so in effect.

But

But, what Proof have we that this Language of Jesus Christ is an improper Language? And then, it is not *Lawful* to make use of such Figures as are injurious to the Glory of God. We cannot without profaneness say, that a Man is as Great, as Powerful, and as Wise as God. 'Twould be to no purpose to say, that these are *Hyperbolies*, that is to say, Figures, and not proper Expressions. For it might be very well answer'd, that there are some Figures that are Impious; and that such *Hyperbolies* as dare put in parallel the Creator with the Creature, are of this Number.

If in the Stile of the World, it is said of Mortal Beauties that they are Adorable; if they are treated as so many Divinities; if Men pretend to offer Incense and Sacrifices to them; these figurative Expressions, how figurative soever they are, are never the less impious. The Quality of *Figurative* Expressions don't defend 'em. Nor is it a sufficient Apology for them to say, that they are never taken in the rigour of the Letter; and that there is no Person so far deceiv'd by this kind of Expressions, as to mistake a Beautiful Woman for a Divinity. For, to render these Figures impious, it is enough if they contain in them an irreverence and want of respect directly or indirectly for the True God. And if in Humane Language we ought not to suffer such Figures as carry in them any Disadvantageous Idea of the Deity, how much less ought we in a Language Sacred and Divine, as is that of the Scripture! And if *Hyperbolies* are unsufferable in the Case of doing Honour to mortal Beauties, which we cannot possibly ever confound with the Supreme God; how much more dangerous will they be in the Case of a Subject, that may (as the Event hath fully shew'd with respect to Jesus

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

298

Jesus Christ) be easily confounded with the Supreme Being!

Our *Second Proposition* is, that if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, 'twill follow, *That Mahomet was a much wiser Person than Jesus Christ.* Indeed as Wisdom consists essentially in chusing the fittest Means to attain the proposed End; we need only examine what is the *End* of the One and the Other in the Establishment of their Religions, and then see what *Methods* they take to succeed in their Designs. The Design of *Mahomet* is, as he declares, to make known the Supreme God to be the only God, who is in himself exalted far above all other Beings, and whom we ought in all Acts of Religion to distinguish from all others, even from Jesus Christ himself; acknowledging that *He* is very far from partaking with the Supreme God in the Glory of the Deity. This is what *Mahomet* indeavours to persuade Mankind of. And to succeed herein, he makes choice of the clearest and most proper Expressions in the World. He does loudly and violently declare, that such as acknowledge Jesus Christ for God, are downright Idolaters. Which is the direct way to accomplish his end. Now let us see whether Jesus Christ will succeed in like manner in his Design. It is suppos'd that his end is to glorifie God. To *Glorifie God*, is evidently to exalt him above all other Beings. This is the peculiar Stile of the Scripture. For, the Antient Prophets, when they would express that God should be glorify'd in an extraordinary manner in the Latter Times, say, *In that Day shall all Things be Humbled, and God alone shall be Exalted.* Now at the same time that Jesus Christ professeth to exalt God, he abaseth him, seeing he doth by his Expressions confound himself with him. For, is it not confounding

founding himself with him, to call himself God, to attribute to himself the Work of Creation, together with all the Attributes of the Deity, and to apply to himself, or suffer others to apply to him the Oracles of the Old Testament, which display the most Essential Characters of the Glory of the Supreme Being? It may be said, that 'tis sufficient if Jesus Christ does declare, that *his Father is greater than He*. But, *First*, it would be a very haughty kind of Modesty for a mere Creature to say, that the Supreme God is greater than the He. *Moses, Esaias*, and the *Prophets* don't speak so. A Subject never affects to say that his King is greater than he. That's taken for granted. Nor will a Creature dare say so of his Creator, because this were to put himself in parallel with him. Besides, what does it signifie for Jesus Christ to declare, that his Father is greater than he; (in what Sence we shall see hereafter) what, I say, does it signifie for him to declare so once upon a single occasion, when his constant Conduct, Behaviour, Language, and the Language he taught his Disciples, do most expressly tell us, that he confounds himself with the Supreme Being? It will be reply'd, that when we say that Jesus Christ confounds himself with the Supreme Being, we beg the Question; and the Expressions that give us this Idea ought to be taken in quite another Sence from what we give them. When Jesus Christ (for instance) is called *God*, they would have this signifie no more then a Man sent from God, and representing God: When it is said, that *he made the Worlds*, the meaning is, that he made up the Happiness of the Age to come, which the Jews expected with so much earnestness. When his Disciples inform us, that *all Things Visible and Invisible were created by him*, the meaning is, that

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

31

he made this change in them, which is that the *Visible* Creatures (as Men) were enlightened with the knowledge of the Gospel; and the *Invisible* Creatures (as the Angels) began to have Head they never had before, viz. Jesus Christ: When his Disciples say, that *he was in the Beginning*, and that *all things were made by him*, this signifies, that he was from the Time of *John* the Baptist, and is the Author of the Gospel and of all that is done under that Dispensation: When Jesus Christ is called *God manifested in the Flesh*, the meaning is, he's a Creature that represents God; and when it is said of him, in opposition to the Angels, that *he laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and that *the Heavens are the Work of his Hands*, this is attributed to him by way of Accomodation, and not after the rigour of the Letter, &c.

A very little common Sense is enough to let us see how forc'd and violent all these Expositions are. However, let us suppose they were to the purpose, yet it cannot be deny'd but that these Expressions, if they are to be taken in this Sence, are somewhat Obscure and Equivocal. It cannot, I say, be deny'd; since we have been for so many Ages without ever understanding them; and constantly the first Impression they naturally form in our Minds, gives us quite another Sence of them.

Now this unquestionable Truth is sufficient to persuade us that Jesus Christ (if I may be allowed to say without Blasphemy) was not so Wise in his Language and Expressions as *Mahomet*. For *Mahomet* always spoke proper, clearly, expressly, and peremptorily, in order to shew that the Supreme God was in no wise to be confounded with the Creature. This is undeniable: for the Thing speaks of it self. Any one may see how he expresses himself in his *Alcoran*. On the contrary, Jesus Christ has us'd, or (which comes to

to the same Thing) has suffer'd his Disciples to use such Expressions as are Obscure, Equivocal, and even Captious; and as seem, by their natural impression, to confound Jesus Christ with the Supreme God: Men being oblig'd to take Terms in their Common and Natural Signification, and not in a Violent and Extraordinary one. It follows therefore, that the Language of *Mahomet* is more proper to exalt and glorify the Supreme God, than the Language of Jesus Christ; and consequently if the Design of Jesus Christ is to glorify God, he has not succeeded in this Design so well as *Mahomet*. Which is a Conclusion equally Impious and Extravagant.

I add in the *Third Place*, that if the Sentiment of our Adversaries were reasonable, *Mahomet* must have been more Charitable towards Mankind than *Jesus Christ*. In effect, Two Things are certain. *First*, that the Greatest Mark of Charity that can be given to Men is, to preserve 'em from Idolatry; seeing Idolatry destroys their Souls, and those that commit it shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven. *Secondly*, if it be true that Jesus Christ is not of One and the Same Essence with the Supreme God, then *Mahomet* has taken proper Measures to prevent Men from falling into Idolatry, and Jesus Christ has not. *Mahomet* has abolish'd the *Christian* Idolatry, and lay'd such Foundations of his own Religion, that Men cannot become Idolaters but by first ceasing to be of the Number of his Disciples. But as for Jesus Christ, we may truly say, that if the Sentiments of our Adversaries are right, He has given occasion, either by his own Expressions, or by the Expressions of his Disciples, to the most palpable Idolatry that ever was in the World. For, he does not only suffer Men to give him the Title of God, but also to attribute to him the most

most Incommunicable Properties of the Deity, and to apply to him the Oracles of the old Testament which express the most peculiar Characters of the Glory of the Supreme Being. It is, for instance, a very surprizing Thing, that Jesus Christ when he appear'd to *Thomas* after his Resurrection, should suffer him to cry out, *My Lord, and My God !* and never say one Word to him of the Impiety and Horrid Blasphemy of an Exclamation that confounds the Creature with the Creator. *Thomas* was, before, an Unbeliever, and now he's an Idolater. Before he could not be convinced of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ ; and now he confounds him with the Deity, by giving him a Title that is given to God alone. Certainly, of these two Extremes the latter is most condemnable. Unbelief, is not by far so Criminal as Idolatry. For Unbelief, *directly*, wrongs *Jesus Christ* only ; but Idolatry wrongs *God himself*. It had therefore been much better if *Thomas* had perished in his Unbelief, than to step out of Unbelief into Idolatry. And yet Jesus Christ upbraids him only with the *former*, not at all with the latter. Which is very strange and unaccountable. Wherefore it appears to me to be so much the more contrary to the Charity Jesus Christ ought to have had for Mankind, in that he could not but be sensible what an Impression these Expressions made upon the Minds of Men in general, as well upon his Friends as upon his Enemies. As he was not ignorant of the time past and to come, he likewise knew that the Jews, deceiv'd by Expressions less exceptionable than these, had before accus'd him of Blasphemy: and that these very expressions would give Occasion to the Christians in succeeding Ages, to confound him with the Supreme God, by maintaining that he was of One and the Same Essence

with him. Seeing then he understood the time past and to come in this respect, it is evident that in point of Charity Jesus Christ, should have taken care to suppress and prohibit all such Expressions as might tend to make so dangerous an Impression. And yet it appears to us, that he does not only suffer his Disciples to *speak* after this manner, but also to set down in Writing Things so apparently Impious and full of Blasphemy, without giving them the least Expulsion or Restriction in the World.

But it will be said that these Expressions which denote the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, are Equivocal. I answer, *First*, that I do not see what Equivocation can be found in Words that expressly say, *Jesus Christ hath laid the Foundation of the Earth; the Heavens are the Work of his Hands; by him and for him all things are, &c.* But, *Secondly*, tho' it were true that these Expressions were Equivocal, yet if such Ambiguity be contrary to the Glory of God, even that would be sufficient to condemn them as Impious.

And this consideration leads us to shew in the *Fourth* and Last Place that, if Jesus Christ were not of One and the Same Essence with the Supreme God, *Mahomet* must have appear'd more zealous for the Glory of God, than Jesus Christ. Which is soon apprehended, if we do but consider what it is to glorify God. As then the *Essential* Glory of God consists in the Eminency of his Perfections, whereby he is exalted above all other Beings: So the *External* Glory of God consists in the Acts of Religion, whereby he is distinguish'd from all his Creatures. Now I am very sensible *Mahomet* has glorify'd God by distinguishing him from all other Beings: But it can never be apprehended how God has been Glorify'd by Jesus Christ, when his own Language

guage and the Language of his Disciples seem to have no other tendency but to confound a mere Creature with the supreme God. Certain it is, that these Expressions which do attribute to the Creature the Characters of the Glory of the Creator, are positively Sacrilegious. Nay further, I maintain that tho' they might possibly receive a sense that is not impious, yet it is sufficient to render them Condemnable, that they are Equivocal, and capable of being interpreted to the Prejudice of the Glory of God. For, if in Civil Commerce, an Equivocal Language which might be explained to the injury of the service of our Sovereign, would be accounted Criminal; and if, on such Occasions as the Royal Authority is interested in, we look upon the silence and Equivocations of such as express themselves ambiguously, when they ought to speak clearly for their Master's Glory, as so many Acts of Treason: have we not reason to accuse the Ambiguity and Equivocations of the Case before us, of Impiety and Blasphemy, tho' there were nothing else to induce us to do it? But, a Man must pull his eyes out, not to see that there's some what more than Mere Ambiguity and Equivocation in a Language, which being no less than a perpetual Application of the Characters of the Glory of the Supreme God unto Jesus Christ, is, if Jesus Christ be not of One and the same Essence with Him, no less than a Continual Profanation.

Thus, if we suppose, that Jesus Christ is only a mere Creature, it clearly follows that *Mahomet* who had no greater desire than to Establish that Principle, has spoken conformably to Truth, Prudence, Charity and Piety; whereas Jesus Christ (if we may be allowed to say so) has spoken falsely, imprudently, cruelly towards

us and impiously towards God : which is a Difference so far from being inconsiderable , that it is altogether extravagant.

But if, on the contrary, we suppose that Jesus Christ is of One and the same Essence with the Supreme God, 'Tis clear that Jesus Christ has, whenever he attributed to himself the Names, Titles and Works of God, always spoken *conformably to the Truth* : He has spoken most *wisely* ; since he has made use of the fittest Expressions to make us understand this Grand Principle : he has spoken with *Charity* ; in that he was not willing to leave us Ignorant of so necessary a Truth : and Lastly he has spoken most *agreeably to Piety* ; since we cannot omit our Duty to Jesus Christ without Offending God Himself, if so be it is time that Jesus Christ is of One and the same Essence with God.

On the Other side, *Mahomet* has, according to this supposition , spoken neither *conformably to the Truth*, seeing he has maintain'd that Jesus Christ is not what indeed he is, nor conformably to his own *Design of Glorifying God*, seeing by wronging Jesus Christ, we wrong God Himself ; nor conformably to *Charity*, seeing he teaches Mankind to Blaspheme Jesus Christ, and thereby ingage them in Everlasting Death ; nor, lastly, *conformably to Piety*, seeing he cannot prejudice the Glory of Jesus Christ, without prejudicing at the same time the Glory of God, supposing that Jesus Christ is of One and the same Essence with him.

It is easie to Judge, which Sentiment ought to be receiv'd as True and Orthodox ; whether the Sentiment of those who believe Jesus Christ to be but a mere Creature, and from which such dreadful consequences may be drawn ; or the Sentiment of such as Establish the Consubstantiality

tiality of Jesus Christ with his Father, from whence such reasonable Consequences do Flow.

In Short, there are very few Objections that can be made against all the Principles we have laid down, but may be very easily answered.

For, if it be said that *Mahomet* is chargeable with not having formed Ideas great enough concerning Jesus Christ, it is easy to answer, that the Prejudice he has done Religion herein is very inconsiderable, compar'd with the Advantages he has procur'd it by destroying those Extravagant Ideas which Men had form'd of the *Son of Mary*. For to represent a Creature less Excellent than indeed it is, is no great Harm, especially then this Creature was become the Idol of Mankind. But to teach Men not to confound the Creature with the Creatour, is the Master-piece of Piety and Religion *Mahomet* lookt upon Jesus Christ as a mere Men. But nevertheless, as One sent from God, and it is principally under this Notion, that our Adversaries would have us consider him. Indeed if *Mahomet* abolishes a detestable Idolatry, and thereby exalts the supreme God as much as Men had before debased him, he may very well be pardon'd this small Fault, viz. his not exalting Jesus Christ enough. We may add, that the debasing of Jesus Christ, as a mere Man, or a mere Creature, would be very just and lawful, if it any way served to glorifie or exalt the most high God.

If it be objected in the second place, that supposing *Mahomet* had some advantage over Jesus Christ in some respects, this will not hinder Jesus Christ from having far greater over him in others; We answer that the most essential and important Parts of Religion do respect the Glory of God, and the Salvation of our Souls seeing these

are the two great ends of Religion. So that it being evident that *Mahomet* hath better succeeded in his Design of exalting and glorifying God, and preserving Men from Idolatry, which is contrary to their Salvation, than *Jesus Christ* did, as we have already shewn; it follows that *Mahomet* is indeed to be preferred before *Jesus Christ*. Yea, I go farther, and affirm that if the Principle of our Adversaries be true, *Jesus Christ* robs God of his Glory, and *Mahomet* restores it to him.

If it be said, that *Mahomet* only pretended, but never sincerely designed the advancement of the Glory of God; we answer that according to the Maxime of *Jesus Christ*, Teachers are to be known by their Fruit.

If it be objected that *Mahomet* wrought no Miracles, we shall say that 'tis not essential to a true Prophet to work Miracles, as appears by the Example of *John the Baptist*; and the Law also teacheth us not to judge of a Doctrine by its Miracles, but of Miracles by the Doctrine.

If it be farther said, that *Jesus Christ* was foretold by the Oracles of the Prophets and that *Mahomet* could never boast of this advantage, this also adds to the confusion of our Adversaries. For can we conceive the Reason why the Ancient Oracles should not foretel the coming of *Mahomet* who destroyed Idolatry in the best and most considerable part of the Universe when they foretold the coming of him, who was to be the Idol of the Christians for many Ages and who by his own Expressions, and those of his Disciples, would give occasion to the setting up the most horrible and most monstrous Idolatry that ever was? Was not the coming and Ministry of a Man that would equal and confound himself with the Sovereign God, a very fine

Matter

Matter of Joy to be thus celebrated by a Prophet, *Lift up thy self, and be thou enlightened, for the Light is come and the Glory of the Lord is risen upon thee?*

If it be said, that the Morals of Jesus Christ excel those of *Mahomet*, we ask, what Excellency can there be in those Morals, which do not hinder Christians from being guilty of Impiety and Blasphemy, nor *Mahomet* from being more Charitable and Zealous for the Glory of God than Jesus Christ. Certainly, if Jesus Christ be not of One and the Same Essence with the True God, the Christian Religion is rather a Doctrine of Impiety than that of Piety.

If it be said that *Mahomet* promoted his Design by Policy, whereas Jesus Christ carryed on his by way of persuation: We desire to know, in whom there are more visible Characters of the Spirit of the World, whether in a Man who not being God, attributes to himself the most Essential Character of the Glory of God, as Jesus Christ did; or in a Man whose principal Aim in the Establishment of his Religion, was to exalt and glorify the True God, by showing that no mere Creature ought to be associated with him?

If it be objected, that *Mahomet* flatters Flesh and Blood, by promising a sensual Paradise replenished with gross and carnal Delights, we need only to answer (without examining whether the Disciples of *Mahomet* do not Spiritualize their *Alcoran*, and take the gross Expressions in a Mystical and Spiritual Sense, as indeed they do) that those Vices that arise from the Affections of Flesh and Blood, are not so dangerous as those that arise from the Pride and Impiety of the Mind. And therefore the Morals of *Mahomet*

would in this respect be less dangerous, than the Doctrine of Jesus Christ.

To conclude, as long as 'tis supposed that Jesus Christ hath given occasion to Christian Idolatry by speaking as he hath done, and *Mahomet* on the contrary hath abolished this Idolatry, we shall find that the Advantages Jesus Christ has over *Mahomet* are very small, and the Advantages *Mahomet* hath over Jesus Christ are very considerable, because there is nothing more Essential in Religion than the glorifying of God.

And thus we begin to see that the Truth of the Christian Religion and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ are so essentially united, that we cannot establish the one without justifying the other, nor destroy the latter without renouncing the former : But this is what we shall with much more evidence and force prove in the prosecution of this Work.

S E C T.

S E C T. II.

In which 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ were not the True God, of One and the Same Essence with his Father, the *Sanhedrim* did an act of Justice in putting him to Death, or at least the *Jews* did well in adhering to the Sentence they pass'd upon him.

C H A P. I.

The first Proof drawn from hence, that Jesus Christ took upon him the Name of God.

AS the Opinion of those that believe Jesus Christ to be but a mere Man or a mere Creature does consecrate the *Mahometan* Religion, so it also tends to the justification of the *Jews* in the most execrable Parricide that was ever acted or conceived, viz. the Murder of Jesus Christ our Saviour.

To justify the *Jews* fully in this Matter we need only show, first of all that the *Sanhedrim* had a right to judge Jesus Christ; secondly, that they had just Cause to condemn him; thirdly, they had a right to put him to Death: and

and lastly, that the *Jews* had reason to adhere to the Sentence of their *Sanhedrim*, and reject the preaching of those that proposed this Crucified Person to them and pressed them to believe on him. Now 'tis certain that these four Propositions are true, if Jesus Christ be but a mere Man, or a mere Creature, and not the Supreme God.

As for the Right or Authority which they had to judge Jesus Christ this is incontestible; since the *Sanhedrim*, was a Council established by God himself and took cognizance of all capital Affairs in general, that regarded the Tranquillity of the State, or the preservation of Religion.

Nor is it less certain that they had a right to put him to Death if he were convicted of Blasphemy, and to reject the preaching of his Apostles if he were justly put to Death. So that the whole difficulty lies wholly in this, whether or no they could convict him of Blasphemy: He is no longer on the Earth. The *Jews* cannot bring him again to the Bar and proceed to a new Tryal, but they may easily know his Doctrine by those Writings his Disciples have left us. Indeed, the Testimony which Jesus Christ gave of himself, ought to be accounted the same with that which his Disciples gave of him, since all agree in this, that they spake by the Order and Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Now it appears by the Writings of his Disciples, 1. That Jesus Christ was called God. 2. That all the Perfections of God were attributed to him, an Honour never given to any but God. 3. That he caused himself to be adored. 4. That he was equalled unto God. 5. That the Oracles of the Old Testament, which express the Glory of God, were ascribed unto him: and 'tis evident by the Light of Nature, that all this cannot

not

not be said of a mere Man, or a mere Creature without manifest Blasphemy.

Let us for a Moment put our selves in the place of the *Jews* of our Time, and try, whether, supposing the principle of our Adversaries to be true, we are not obliged to persevere in our Incredulity.

To induce us to part with it, one of these two Things must be done: Either we must be persuaded that Jesus Christ was not called God, that he did not cause himself to be adored, that he did not pretend to be equal with his Father, that he hath neither apply'd himself nor suffer'd others to apply to him, the Oracles of the old Testament which express the Glory of the Supreme Being; or else we must believe that a mere Man may without Impiety take upon him that Name of God, with that Idea which this august Name contains in it and the Glory and Worship that necessary follows this Idea.

The former is not possible; Jesus Christ is called God in the Writings of the Apostles, he is named the great God. *Thomas* after his Resurrection said to him, *My Lord, and my God!* *St. John* begins his Gospel thus: *In the beginning was the Word and the Word was God.* *St. Paul* calls him, *God manifested in the Flesh, and justify'd in the Spirit.* 'Tis of no importance whether it were in Greek or Hebrew, that this Name was given to Jesus Christ. Every Body knows that in all Languages this Word expresseth the Glory of an Essence exalted far above ours. Moreover, we cannot doubt but the Apostles attributed unto Jesus Christ all the Names of God which were consecrated in the use of the Holy Tongue, since they apply unto him all the Oracles in which the Supreme God is spoken of.

'Tis

'Tis to be observed here that the five Heads of accusation which the *Jews* may form against Jesus Christ, mutually support each other. We can't doubt but Jesus Christ took on himself the Name of God, since he caused himself to be adored, we cannot doubt but he caused himself to be adored in a proper Sence, since he took upon him the Name of God. We cannot question but this Name was attributed to him, as it expresseth the Glory of God, since this Name is not only given him, but 'tis given him with the Idea of all those Perfections, which this great Name contains in it; yea, he is equalled unto God, after having Divine Perfections attributed to him. We cannot deny but he was equalled unto God, because the Oracles which speak of the Supreme God, and him alone, and which express that Characters of his Essential Glory were applyed unto him. But we must particularly consider all those things.

Every Body knows that we all naturally scruple to take upon us the Name of God. If it be demanded from whence is this repugnance? 'Tis either from the respect we have to the Deity, or from some other Principle. If it be from some other Principle, we should fain know what this Principle is. If it be for the respect we have for the Deity, I demand farther, whether it be from the respect we have for the Supreme Being, or from the respect we have for some subordinate Divinity; if it be the latter, it would follow that such as acknowledge no subordinate Divinity, make no scruple of taking on themselves the Name of God, which would be very extravagant. If it be from the respect which we have for the Supreme God that we refuse to take on us the Name of God, it follows that we are persuaded that in taking
this

this Name of God upon us, we should be injurious to the Supreme Being ; and consequently we must be persuaded that this Name is proper and peculiar to the Supreme Being ; and if we believe that this Name is proper and consecrated to the Supreme Being, we cannot but account him an impious Wretch, who not being the Supreme God, durst take this Name upon himself.

And indeed the Name of Jesus Christ, of Saviour and Redeemer of the World, is not more proper and peculiar to the Son of *Mary*, than the Name of God, is to the Supreme Being ; for as hitherto no Christians durst give this Name to any other but the Son of *Mary*, so no *Jews* durst give the Name of God to any other, but the Supreme God. And as the Christians no sooner hear this adorable Name Jesus Christ, but they represent to themselves this Holy and Divine Man, who was conceived in the Womb of *Mary*, so this august Name of God, or somewhat answering to it, is no longer pronounced amongst the *Jews*, but they have an Idea of that great God that created Heaven and Earth. As therefore, a Man that should now pretend to the Name of Jesus Christ without being so indeed, and should desire to be adored as our Saviour, would justly be condemned of Blasphemy, so also we maintain that a Man that hath taken upon him the Name of God, without being the Supreme God, might justly be condemned of impiety. 'Twill be to no purpose to say that although Jesus Christ took on him the Name of God, yet he gave sufficient Notice that he was not the Supreme God. For first, 'tis false that Jesus Christ gave any such Notice, at least not sufficient Notice that he was the Supreme God. The contrary evidently

ly appears by his Language and Conduct. For if he be not the Supreme God, why doth he take the Name that is proper and consecrated to the Supreme God? If he be not the Supreme God, why did he cause Men to adore him? Adoration being an Homage or Act of Worship proper to the Supreme God. But Secondly, I answer, that as it would be impious for a Man, that acknowledged himself not to be Jesus Christ, to take upon him the Names and Qualities of Jesus Christ, and pretend to the Worship which is due only to this Divine Saviour, so 'tis also impious for a Man, who is not the Supreme God, to take on him the Names and Attributes of the Supreme God, and by causing himself to be ador'd to usurp the Honour which is never given to any but the Supreme God.

Suppose that *Moses* returning from the Holy Mount, and having his Face shining by reason of the Converse he had with God, should have presumed to take on him the Name of God; had attributed to himself what only agrees with the Supreme Being and claimed a right unto the Adoration and Worship of the People, tho' in the mean time he was perfectly known to be but a mere Man; I maintain that the People of *Israel* would have had good Ground to have rejected him as a Seducer, without having any Consideration for the Glory of those great and sensible Miracles that were wrought by him. For *Moses* by such an Act would have destroyed the Law at the same time, in which he gave it. He had from God commanded the People to have no other Gods before his Face, and yet he would have put himself in the place of God. But if the *Jews* would have done well to have rejected *Moses*, calling himself God; it seems to me, that we must confess, that the *Jews* who

posed the *Sanhedrim*, could not but condemn Jesus Christ to Death for Blasphemy, when he either required or only permitted others to honour him as God.

For when the Names and Glory of God are usurped, neither Miracles nor the pretended Dignity of the Person accused ought to be accounted as any thing at all. Not Miracles ; because Miracles cannot authorize Blasphemy, or cause it to be received : On the contrary, Blasphemy ought to cause us to reject those Miracles that favour it : Not the Dignity of the Person who is guilty of this Usurpation ; because the robbing God of his Glory, is a Crime by so much the more odious, by how much the more excellent the Person is, that is guilty of it.

Should the Head of a Family resolve to take on him the Quality of a King, under pretence that he has some Authority over his Children ? Should he often actually take it on him, without any Restriction or Explication ? Especially, should he endeavour to be honoured as a King, without doubt he would involve himself in much guilt. But the Crime would be yet more aggravated, if a Magistrate should usurp his Name amongst his Fellow-Citizens ; because such an Attempt would be of more dangerous Consequence. The Crime would still be greater, if a Governour of a Province should do this, and proportionably so much greater yet, by how much the Dignity of the guilty Person is so. Thus the Name of God being consecrated, by a most Ancient and Holy Use, to represent the God that hath made Heaven and Earth ; to give it to any other is so far from being justified, by Mens pleading the Nobleness and Excellency of the Creature to whom 'tis ascribed, that it becomes

comes by this very Consideration, more aggravatedly, Blasphemous and Impious.

'Tis also fit to observe that the Name of [God] in our Language and that of Θεός in Greek, do exactly answer those august and venerable Names, which God takes upon himself in the Old Testament. Names which ought to be sacred, because God himself imposed them on himself; secondly, because they distinguish this Great God from his Creatures. One of them signifies [*He that is Sufficient*] to shew that all other Things have need of God, but that God hath no need of their Assistance, in order to his being perfectly Holy and Happy. Another signifies, *I am*, or *I am that I am*: to shew both that God is essentially and of himself, that he is not the Creatures, which are composed partly of Being, and partly of Nothing, and that he is Eternal and will never cease to be. Others also signify, *He that is the Judge*, or *the Foundation of all Things*, &c.

And 'tis observable that all these Names contain in them such an Eminency of Perfections and Glory, that they can never agree with any but the Supreme Being. For we cannot say of a Creature, that it is the Foundation of all Things, that it is by and of it self, and that infallibly it will ever be.

But 'tis observable, that in the Language of the New Testament there are two Names, which express what is signified by those diverse Names which are Θεός and Κύριος, imployed both by the Seventy and the Apostles themselves, to render the Names which God attributeth to himself in the Oracles of the Old Testament; but they are Names so proper and consecrated to God, that we have no Example of any that have taken them on themselves under the New Dispensation.

And

And certainly, we ought not to imagine that the Names which God hath consecrated for himself under the New Testament, are less sacred or less proper to him, than those he took upon himself under the Old. For if it were then necessary that God be distinguish'd, from his Creatures, and if for this end he took on him such Names as express his most Essential and Incommunicable Glory, 'tis not now less necessary that God should be distinguish'd from his Works. On the contrary the necessity is greater, because this is the Time that was foretold by the Prophets: *In which all Things must be debased, and God alone exalted.* As therefore, there would have been no great need to seek many Arguments to convict a Man of Impiety and Blasphemy, who under the Old Testament should be found to have presumed to Usurp the Name of *Jehovah*, with the Adoration due to him represented by this Name, so there is nothing more apparent than the Impiety of him, who should now Usurp the Name of God: and pretend to that Adoration which is a Worship that hath been always join'd only to this Name.

Indeed, Blasphemy and Idolatry consists in a Man's ascribing to himself, not only all the Glory of God, but also part of it. This is what may be justified by incontestible Examples. When *Herod* making an Oration to the People was smitten with an Ulcer, for having permitted these Acclamations, *The Voice of a God and not of a Man*; neither the People certainly, nor *Herod* imagined to be true according to the Letter. *Herod* did not believe himself to be the Supreme God, nor did the People imagine that their King was all at once changed into the Supreme Being. Yet his Impiety met with an

exemplary Punishment. So that 'twill not be enough to justifie Jesus Christ against the charge of Blasphemy, if he be what our Adversaries believe him to be, to say, that he declared himself to be a Man, and that he acknowledged his Father was greater than himself. A Man may be impious without declaring himself to be the Supreme God, as appears by the Example above mentioned, and Impiety and Blasphemy consists in Usurping not only all the Glory of God, but also a part of it.

Have not then the *Jews* who consider all these Things Reason to adhere to their *Sanhedrim*, and pretend that Jesus Christ our Saviour was justly condemned to Death, after having been convicted of Blasphemy? And what can our Adversaries answer them in justification of our Messiah? They will say one Thing, for there is but one Thing that they can say, *viz.* that there is this difference between *Herod* and *Jesus Christ*, that the former consented to be Honour'd as a God, out of Pride; and contrary to the Will of God, whereas Jesus Christ calls himself God, only because God will have it so. But our Adversaries will be urged farther, to shew in what place God hath delivered that he would have Jesus Christ bear his Name, and then they'll be obliged to answer one of these three Things; they'll say that God hath declared it either by the *Prophets*, or by the Mouth of his *Son*, or by the *Ministry of his Apostles*. If they say that God hath declared his Will in this respect by the *Ministry of his Son*, the *Jews* will presently ask whether all the Seducers in the World will not return the same Answer. They will all say that God hath commanded them to Name and Qualify themselves as they do. But they'll be easily convinced of Lyes, and
their

their Miracles proved to be meer imposture in that they Usurp the Names and Glory of God. If they say that God hath detained his Will in this respect by the *Apostles*, they entangle themselves no less ridiculously than before. For they that condemned Jesus Christ, condemn his Apostles as well as him, and accuse them of Blasphemy in robbing God of his Glory to give it to another. It remains therefore, that they say, that 'tis by the Ministry of the Prophets, that God hath made known his Will, that Jesus Christ should bear his Name, and that he should be adored by the other Creatures. But if our Adversaries answer thus, they are forced to acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God. For all the Oracles of the Old Testament that speak of Jesus Christ as of a God, confound him with the Supreme God, as we have partly shown already, and shall further show hereafter. There is nothing so express as the Commandment which is given to all the Angels, to adore him, but there is also nothing so certain as that 'tis the Supreme God that is there spoken of. To conclude, since the Prophets have a Thousand and a Thousand Times declared that there's but one only God, who is God the Creator of Heaven and Earth; 'tis evident that he whom the Prophets speak of as the true God, is necessarily confounded with the Supreme God.

It must necessarily be that the God, whom the Prophets foretel as coming, as sending his Messenger before his Face, as sending his Servants to say to *Jerusalem*, *Behold thy God*, it must necessarily be, I say, that this God is the same that made Heaven and Earth. For two things are certain, first, that if this be not the same God, there must be two Gods of whom the Prophets

A Treatise concerning the

Speak; secondly, that the Law and the Prophets lay down no Principle as more Essential than this, *There is but one only God.*

The Jews cannot be ignorant of a Truth which is the Essential Foundation of all their Religion. *Isaiah* saith no other thing, *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, their Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the First and the Last, there is no other God besides me.* This signifies that he is God who can Name himself *Jehovah, the Redeemer of Israel, the God of Hosts, the First and the Last*; but that he, who possesseth not these Titles, neither can nor ought to be lookt upon as God. You see that the Jews have Reason to adhere to this great Principle, that there is but one God, and that no other but the Sovereign God ought to have this great Name. *I am the Lord,* saith he, by the Mouth of the same Prophet, and there is none else, there is no God besides me: *I girded thee tho thou hast not known me: that they may know from the rising of the Sun, and from the going down of the Same, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none else: I form the Light and create Darkness: I make Peace and create Evil: I the Lord do all these Things.* Pray do but see with what Case the Prophet repeats this Essential and Capital Truth, *That there is but one God,* and that we ought to account him alone to be so; who hath created the Light and formed the Darkness. *Look unto me all ye Ends of the Earth, and be ye saved, I am the Mighty God and there is none else.*

'Tis on this Principle, will the Jews say, that our Fathers have judg'd your Messiah. He called himself God, and we know there is but one God, who created Heaven and Earth. Your Messiah not being this God, could not be God, since we know that there is no other God.

God. He was therefore guilty of Blasphemy.

What answer can we return to the Jews in this Matter, if we suppose that Jesus-Christ is a mere Man, and yet called himself God? Shall we say, that he is an *Equivocal God*, and that nothing but the bare sound of this Expression belongeth to him? No, for if it were thus, Jesus Christ would no more deserve to have the Name of God, than another Man. Shall we say that he is a *Metaphorical God*, is called God in the same Sence Kings are? But the contrary appears by his causing himself to be adored. When we call a Man that is extremely Brave, King of the Couragious, we do not yet ascribe any Majesty to him. Besides, when we attribute any thing to a Person Metaphorically, we do not use the Name simply without any *Salvo* or Explication. Shall we say that Jesus Christ is a God properly called, but that he is only a subordinate God, and depending on the Supreme God? This is indeed the Answer of such as believe that he is by his Essence, but a mere Creature. But it falls out very unhappy for them, that the Scriptures when it excludes a plurality of Gods, by establishing the Unity of God, does also exclude subordinate Gods. For it excludes such Gods as have not created all things, as appears every where in the Old Testament.

Furthermore, I ask when the Supreme Lawgiver, says in the Decalogue, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, whether he means to exclude at once all Things that are not the Supreme God, or only some of those things. If he means to exclude but some of those things, it follows, that when the Lawgiver said, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, the *Israelites* might understand that it was allowed 'em to have some other Gods before him. But if God

forbids to adore all other things that are not the Supreme God without exception, it follows that the *Jews* were in the right to accuse Jesus Christ of Blasphemy, when he desir'd to be own'd by them as a subordinate God, against this so plain Command of their Law.

Perhaps some will say, that when the Supreme Law-giver says in his Law, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*; he means chiefly to exclude the False Gods of the Heathens. That's nothing to the purpose. For, *First*, when he excludes false Gods in that Place he does it by a general Proposition, which excludes all such Objects of our Worship as are not the Supreme God. For the Law-giver does not abhor the Idols of the Heathens, because they are the Idols of the Heathens, but because they are not the True God, and yet are worshipt as if they were. Suppose then it were not only Wood or Stone, but a Man or an Angel, as soon as you adore it with Divine Worship, you make a Heathen Idol. Otherwise one could not reprove one that worshipt an Angel, by quoting to him the Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*. 'Tis then a General Commandment, that forbids the owning any other God besides the Supreme God, and by consequence excludes all subordinate Gods.

But if the Sence of the Law-giver were this, *Thou shalt have no other Supreme God before me*: One might say that of all the Heathen Gods 'twas only *Jupiter* whose worshipt was condemned in the Commandment. For they counted him alone the Supreme God.

Perhaps some will say, that the Design of the Law and the Prophets in repeating so often, that *the Lord alone is God, that there is none other but he, and that we must have no other Gods before him*,

the
that
nrist
by
lain.

Su-
balt
effly
mens.
irst,
e he
udes
the
t ab-
are
are
as if
only
af-
you
ould
by
balt
ene-
any
l by

this,
me :
Gods
dem-
nted
f the
ften,
other
efore
him,
from

a
If
Pr
rig
ulur
In
but by
sider t.
Name

of
the
kan,
ling
Jews
peak-
ing

ing that God himself has us'd. For, the *Jews* used to affix to that Name the Idea of the Supreme Being, the Idea of the God that made the Heavens and the Earth. For they knew of no other God. The same may be said of the Prophets, who had taught them so, and of the Holy Spirit which had so taught the Prophets.

CHAP. II

A Continuation of the same Proof.

THE *Jews*, who liv'd in the time of the Apostles are in no wise to be blamed for speaking as God and the Prophets taught 'em. They are not to be blamed for not being able to guess that there was a signification of the Name of God, that was unheard of till that time, and such as fully acquitted a Man who without it would have been convicted of Blasphemy. The *Jews* of our Time are least of all to be blamed for speaking as their Fore-fathers have taught 'em.

But it will be proper to inquire how many ways they were instructed in this matter by the Prophets.

I. They constantly put 'em in Mind of this Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*: Without ever adding the least Qualification, or Restriction that might signifie, that this Commandment was not to be lookt upon as general and obligatory to all Ages and Places. Were the *Jews* oblig'd to believe, without any manner of notice, that a Commandment so inalienable till then, ceas'd to be obligatory in the Time of Jesus Christ?

II. They

II. They constantly oppose the God that made all Things, to the Gods that were themselves made. He gives this Character to God, whose Unity they defend upon all Occasions, *viz. That He made the Heavens and the Earth*; and they declare to us, *that there is no other God besides him*. Shall the *Jews* be wiser than the Prophets and make exceptions, where the Prophets made none?

III. They tell us that all other Gods but the true God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, are corruptible, and shall sooner or later all perish. *The Gods, say they, who created not the Heavens and Earth, shall perish upon the Earth*. The Prophet's reasoning is hidden, and implicit, which may be thus unfolded. The Gods that created not the Heavens shall perish on the Earth. But the Idols of the Nations are Gods that created not the Heavens. Therefore the Idols of the Nation shall perish upon the Earth. The first Proposition of this Argument is general, teaching the *Jews* to acknowledge no other for God but him that created the Heavens, and endureth everlastingly: should the *Jews* therefore have lookt upon this Principle of the Prophet as false and fallacious?

IV. The next Character they give us of God, is that he cannot be pictur'd, because there is nothing in the World fit to represent him. *To whom will you liken me, saith God, by the Mouth of the Prophet Isaiah, has not my Arm wrought all these Things?* Which gave the *Jews* to understand, that they ought not to acknowledge for God any thing that could be represented by Statues or Images, and consequently to believe that a Man was very far from being able to bear so glorious a Name.

V. The Name of *Jehovah* and all other Names

Names of God were Names of Distinction, which God gave to himself or were given by the Prophets on purpose to exalt him above the Creatures. *I am the Lord*, said God by the Mouth of *Isaiab*, *That is my Name. There is no other God besides me.* The Prophets did also teach to swear by the Name of God. Whosoever, say they, sweareth upon the Earth, shall swear by the God of Truth. Ye shall swear by my Name, saith the Supreme Law-giver. Now this Name either ought to distinguish him from all the Creatures, without exception, or ought to distinguish him but from some of 'em. If it was to distinguish him but from some of his Creatures, God does in vain proclaim by the Mouth of the Prophet, *I am the Lord : That is my Name There is no other God besides me :* because it might be answered him. True, that is thy Name : but yet, it does not distinguish thee from all the Creatures, because there are some, or there will be some, who will take it as well as thou. But if this Name was to distinguish him without exception from all his Creatures, I say, in this case, whosoever takes this august Name, does thereby abandon the Condition of a Creature : and consequently if Jesus Christ take upon him either this Name, or (which is the same thing) any other Names that express the Glory thereof : the *Jews* cannot but accuse him of Impiety and Blasphemy.

VI. What the Prophets tells us concerning the Unity of God, they repeat in almost every Page of their Divine Writings. Now (by the way) we cannot refer the extraordinary care they take to inform us that there is but one God, to any thing else but the danger Men were in to fall into Idolatry by acknowledging for God what indeed was not. Now I would fain know if there

there was no danger of Mens falling into Idolatry when the *Sanhedrim* judged Jesus Christ. Certainly, there was as much then, as in the time of the Prophets: and if we believe our Adversaries, the Event has shew'd that it was possible for Man to become *Pagan* again, by placing a Creature that is honour'd with the Name of God, upon the Throne of the Deity. The *Jews* ought to have taken care of the Glory of God, as the Prophets had done in the time of their Fore-fathers. The *Jews* might foresee that if a mere Man were suffer'd to take the Name of God, he would soon be put in the place of the Supreme Being; and the Event had but too much justify'd 'em in it. If therefore the Prophets had for so many Ages proclaim'd, that there was but one Object, to whom the Name of God did justly belong, least the *Jews* should fall into Idolatry: The same interest engag'd the *Jews* to withstand a Man that durst take upon him the Names and the Titles of God.

VII. It is, very remarkable that the Prophets make it their Business to convince the *Jews* that subordinate and dependent Beings are not to be called Gods, by telling us that we are not to acknowledge them to be Gods, who made not the Heavens and cause not the Rain to descend upon the Earth: Ought the *Jews* to quit this just prejudice all of a sudden, and without any manner of reason? Or, if they don't, can they consent to the Gospel at the same time? They plainly saw that Jesus Christ was a mere Man, and consequently a subordinate and purely dependent Being. And therefore they were oblig'd to look upon the Religion which attributed to him the Names and Titles of God, as Superstitious, or else to despise the Principles of their Prophets.

VIII. The

VIII. The Prophets endeavouring to show us, that God can never consent to see any other Gods honour'd besides himself, borrow the Reason from the Counsel of God: For they introduce God speaking thus, *I will not give my Glory to another.* Therefore the Jews had Reason to think, that God had not given his Glory to Jesus Christ. For, either this Proposition is general, and so signifies that God never gives his Glory to any one: or else it is particular, and only imports that sometimes and on certain occasions God ~~does~~ give his Glory to another. If this Proposition be particular, the reasoning of the Prophet is good for nothing. For it ought to be conceiv'd after this manner. God gives not his Glory to another on some occasions, though he gives it on others. Therefore he will not give his praise to Graven Images. But if this Proposition is general, as according to good Sense and the force of the Words it must be: and so signifies that God gives his Glory to another upon no occasions whatsoever: it follows that the Jews were oblig'd to believe, that God had not given his Glory to Jesus Christ, and consequently Jesus Christ could not without manifest Impiety, either invest himself with the Titles of God, or pretend to Divine Honours, or to such Worship as was wont to be given only to the Supreme Being.

IX. The Prophets have always had so great a respect for the Names which express the Essence and Glory of God, that they carefully avoid taking any Metaphors from them, which is an Essential and Remarkable Difference between Humane and Divine Language. The first being the Language of Men who do not sufficiently respect the Deity, is fill'd with Metaphors taken from God. Every thing there is Divine, Adorable,

rable, Eternal, and Infinite. The Terms of
 Incense, Sacrifice, Dedication, Devotion and a
 Thousand other Expressions which are taken
 from the Worship we owe to God, cost us no-
 thing. Whereas they are banisht from the
 Language of the Holy Spirit, who speaking of
 God as God, and of a Creature as a Creature
 avoids such Metaphors as may be taken from
 the Supreme Being; when he speaks of a Crea-
 ture, He does not say, *The God of Terrors*, but
the King of Terrors. And if the Psalmist once
 happens to say, *Ye are Gods*, he adds immediately
 after, *but ye shall dye like Men*. Upon which we
 are to observe what is the Word in the Original
 'tis אלהים, a Name that is not so peculiar to God
 as the others, because it is also given to Angels:
 a Noun Plural, that is rather an Appellative
 than a Noun Proper: and lastly a Name that
 cannot possibly touch the Glory of God, because it
 is here given to Princes for no other reason but to
 form the Antitheses that should humble 'em.
Ye are Gods, but ye shall dye like Men. And if
 the respect which the Holy Writers of the Old
 Testament had for the proper Names of God,
 be so great; and if the same respect is to be
 found among the Writings of the New Testa-
 ment, who do not take their Figures and their
 Metaphors, when they speak of the Creature,
 from the Attributes of God, as did the Hea-
 then Authors, and as the Modern Authors of
 the Age do to this Day; can we condemn the
Jews of an excessive Tenderness, when they can-
 not suffer the Name of God to be given to a
 mere Man, and also in such a Sense as engages
 us to worship him? For, in short, either the
 Name of God expresses the Glory of the Crea-
 tor, or the Glory of the Creature; or else a
 Glory common to both. It cannot be said that

expresses a Glory common to both the Creator and the Creature. For, if so, the Prophets could not have said, that there is but one God; and every one of us might take this Name without any scruple. It cannot be said, it expresses the Glory of the Creature. For that would be Extravagant. Therefore it follows that it expresses only the Glory of the Creator. Whence we maintain that the *Jews* cannot but accuse him of Blasphemy, who though he is not the Creator, yet gives himself a Name that expresses the Glory of the Creator.

X. In fine, it is certain the Prophets have two principal Ends in informing us of the Name and Attributes of God. *First*, to glorify God by exalting him above all the Creatures. *Secondly*, to save Mankind by preserving them from Superstition and Idolatry. Now, 'tis certain, that these two Ends of Religion perish, in case the *Jews* allow a mere Man to take upon him the Names of God. For, *First*, as Names were given to things, with design to make 'em known, and distinguish one from the other; it follows that if a mere Man take upon him the Names of God, he will be confounded with him at least in some Measure: which is opposite to the *First* End, *namely*, to glorify God by exalting him above all other things. In effect, what Man is so blind as not to see, that if God does glorify himself by appropriating to himself such Names as don't at all agree to a Creature? It follows by the Rule of contraries, that the Creature dishonours God as much as in him lies, whenever it assumes the Names that are consecrated to God. And as to the *Second* End of Religion, which is to keep Men from falling into Idolatry, that is also destroy'd by this Usurpation of the Name of God. For either

ther Jesus Christ attributes to himself this Name *with* an Idea, or he does it *without* an Idea. If *without* an Idea, he attributes it to himself absurdly: Which is Impious. If *with* an Idea, either 'tis the same that Men have affixt to it, or 'tis a particular Idea of his own. If it be the Idea that Men have affixt to it, it must be the Idea of the Supreme Being, and consequently he involves Mankind in Impiety. If it be another Idea, an Idea unknown to Men, he thereby lays snares for 'em, throws 'em into Error, and from Error into Superstition; he makes Language a Commerce full of Illusion and Deceit, whereas by its natural Appointment it ought to be a Commerce of Sincerity and Truth. In fine, we may say, that the signification of the Name of God not depending in the Humour of a private Person, but upon common Consent and Usage, the direction of his meaning can neither save him from being of Blasphemy, nor those that follow him from Idolatry.

And here, perhaps, we shall be told, that Jesus Christ did not call himself God, but the *Son* of God, when he convertt upon Earth; and also that he justify'd himself in such a manner as plainly shew'd that he did not aspire after that first Title, when for this purpose he quoted those words of the Psalmist, *Ye are Gods*, &c. As we design to examine this Passage apart in its proper place, we shall here content our selves with saying two Things. *First*, that it is an incontestible Point between our Adversaries and Us, that Jesus Christ conceals himself on this occasion, as he us'd to do upon many others, and does not tell the *Jews* fully what he is. For to consider only the Impression of his Words, he seems to call himself God, or the Son of God, but in the same Sence that Men of

Figure and Honour in the World bear that Name in Scripture ; and our Adversaries themselves grant that Jesus Christ is God in a manner peculiar to himself, and which cannot agree to the Princes of the Earth ; but that he is so in a very eminent Sence. Which shall be shew'd more distinctly afterwards. It is not here necessary to urge this Consideration, because it is useless. For though it were true that Jesus Christ had not upon any Occasion taken upon him the Name of God ; and that the *Sanhedrim* could say nothing like it to justify the Sentence they pronounced against him : it is however unquestionable that his Disciples gave him both the Names and Praises appropriated to God ; and the *Jews* who have since understood and do still understand their own Language cannot but condemn the Gospel as Impious, and are forced to approve the Sence of their Fore-fathers, when they are told that the Spirit of Jesus Christ is the same with the Spirit of his Disciples, and that his Disciples tell us nothing but he himself would have 'em tell us. And here we shall leave (if you please) the *Jews* that condemned Jesus Christ, and shall insist upon those who afterwards rejected the preaching of the Apostles. We shall make it appear that they ought to look upon them as Men guilty of Blasphemy and that they could not but approve of the Decree past against Jesus Christ, if it be true, that he was by Nature but a mere Creature, or a mere Man. In a word, our business here is not to justify the *Sanhedrim* if one would : but to justify the Zeal which the *Jews* have in all Ages testify'd for the Judgment of the *Sanhedrim*, by considering that those who compos'd it, had a right to Judge Jesus Christ since they were established by God himself to judge all this kind

of Matters ; that they had good Reason to accuse Jesus Christ of Blasphemy, since the Doctrine which his Disciples publish, (by which alone we are able to judge of his Sentiments) invests him with all the Characters of the Supreme God, yea *him* who is but a mere Creature ; in which the very Essence of Profaneness and Blasphemy consists ; and that 'tis undeniable that this Assembly could and ought to condemn Blasphemers to Death, nay that they could not dispence with this Severity without betraying their Duty. It will be objected that the *Jews* who composed the *Sanhedrim*, acted out of Passion and Malice. And it will be answer'd that that may very well be ; but so much the worse for them if they did. It is not for us (say the *Jews* that come afterwards) to judge of the Hearts of our Fore-fathers, which are to us unknown ; but we are to judge of the Justice of their Sentence, with which we are very well acquainted. It was never heard that at a Tryal before any Tribunal in the World, Men lay'd more stress on the surmizes they had conceiv'd of the ill disposition of the Judges, than on the Characters of Justice or Injustice which were found in their Judgment. Indeed, the *Jews* don't know how to sound Mens Hearts ; but their Law teaches them to distinguish Blasphemers, by telling 'em, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, and by obliging 'em thereby to reject him, who being not the God of *Israel*, and the God of their Fathers durst assume the Name and Titles of God.

If he that was to come in the fulness of Time to ransom *Sion*, and to remove the Infidelities of *Jacob*, was to be the True God, the God of *Israel* ; and if the *Jews* are told so by the Oracles of the Prophets as shall be afterwards shew'd

shew'd : Then the *Jews* are manifestly guilty of Impiety. But if he that was to come to do the Work of our Redemption, was to be but a mere Man or a meer Creature : The Disciples of Jesus Christ cannot be excused from Blasphemy, nor Jesus Christ himself be lookt upon as Innocent ; because we suppose his Disciples to speak by his Spirit and Order. Which we shall confirm in the Chapters following.

CHAP. III.

The Second Proof taken from hence, that the Disciples give to Jesus Christ, all the Principal Titles which form the Idea of the Supreme God in the Writings of the Prophets, and which essentially distinguish him from his Creatures.

A GAIN, it appears that Jesus Christ, has truly and properly assum'd the Name of God, in that he has assum'd the Qualities which form the Idea signified by that august Name ; or, if you please, in that the Apostles have ascrib'd to him those Qualities. For as we said before, there is no material Difference in this case between what he says of himself, and what the Apostles say of him : since they speak by his Spirit.

The Prophets had affixt to that Name the Idea of an Almighty Being, which had created the Heavens and the Earth. And we shall find that the Work of the Creation is ascrib'd to Jesus Christ. For by him, saith St. John, all Things were made, and without him was not any thing made that

A Treatise concerning the

was made. By him, says another, and for him are all things. He made all Things, saith St. Paul, Visible and Invisible. He hath laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of his Hands. By him the Worlds were made. It is to no purpose to go about to Cavil concerning the Sence of these Passages. For, it is clear as the Light, that all these things are spoken of Jesus Christ. And this shall be invincibly proved in its proper Place. It is not possible to put another Sence upon these Words, without doing manifest Violence to the Scriptures. The most considerable thing to be remark'd here, is, that the Disciples have so constantly characteriz'd Jesus Christ by the Creation of all things, which is the most ordinary Character the Prophets use to make known the Supreme God, and to raise him above all Things, by the consideration of that Power which has made 'em. Which would have been an Impious Arrogance, if Jesus Christ were a mere Creature.

The Prophets had spoken of God as of a Being that knows all Things, before whom Darknes it self becomes Light. And we shall find, that is ascribed to Jesus Christ that he knows all things. *Lord, says St. Peter, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love thee.* It is to no purpose to object here, that St. Peter speaks of his own Head, and that 'tis no where said that Jesus Christ approv'd of this thought. For it is either Blasphemy or Truth. If Jesus Christ knows all things, 'tis a Truth: if he knows not all things, 'tis Blasphemy. If it be a Truth, it must needs be that Jesus Christ approves of it; for he is Truth it self: and it follows that he would allow St. Peter to say so. If it be Blasphemy, 'tis for the Glory of God, and agreeable to his Care for the Salvation of his

his Disciple, that he should reprove and censure him severely. For what! shall Jesus Christ be so severe to him as to say to him: *Satan, get thee behind me, Thou art a stumbling Block to me. For thou savourest not the Things that are of God, but the Things of Man*: When he did but offer to dissuade him from going up to *Jerusalem* there to suffer Death; and shall Jesus Christ be perfectly silent, in the case of robbing God of his due Praise, to give it another? Certainly, if there were any thing blameable in St. Peter's Zeal upon the Way to *Jerusalem*, it must be this unadvisedness of his, which does not let him see that while he is thinking to speak in favour of his Master, he is hindring a work whereby the Glory of God might be advanced. For as the Glory of God is the ultimate End of all Things, there is nothing so Pernicious, or so worthy of Horrour, as that which is opposite to it. Now the Apostle there does not only speak unadvisedly against the Glory of God, but does openly blaspheme him, if so be his Thought is not true.

St. Peter, on this Occasion, does not only ascribe to Jesus Christ the Knowledge of all Things in General; but also of the Thoughts of the Heart in Particular. Lord, says he, *Thou knowest all Things: thou knowest that I Love thee*. And yet, this is the most Essential Character of the Glory of the supreme God. The Heart, saith God: by the Mouth of *Jeremy*, is *Deceitful above all things, and desperately Wicked: Who can know it?* Chap. 17. *I the Lord search the Heart, I try the Reins &c.* You see here that God attributes, to himself the Knowledge of the Heart, as a Glory peculiar to him, and not belonging to any other. But to put it beyond all doubt, observe what *Solomon* says to this purpose, in a Prayer he directs to God: *Thou, even Thou alone*, saith he to him, 1 Kings 8. 39.

knowest the Hearts of the Children of Men. In which Words he says Two Things: *First* that God knoweth the Hearts of the Children of Men: and Secondly, that he *alone* knoweth them. From whence it follows that the title of *Searcher of Hearts* is comprehended in the proper Idea given us by the Prophets of the God of Israel. And yet Jesus Christ ascribes this Glorious Title to himself, and that in a most Remarkable and solemn manner. *And all the Churches, saith he, shall know that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts: and I will give unto every one according to their Works*

Rev. 2.23.

It follows therefore, that he ascribes to himself not only the Name of God, but also those Attributes which form the most proper Idea of him given us by the Prophets. And if so, then indeed Jesus Christ the God of *Israel*, or the *Jews* are oblig'd to look upon his Language as Impious and full of Blasphemy. What answer can we make to this Objection of theirs?

It will be told 'em, that Jesus Christ does not take this Title of Searcher of Hearts in the same Sence that God took it in the Antient Oracles: that God is said to know the Heart and to try the Reins, it ought to be understood of such a Knowledge as is peculiar to him. For he knoweth of himself, and without the help and assistance of any other. Whereas when Jesus Christ saith that he tryeth the Heart and the Reins, this is understood of such a Knowledge, as is receiv'd from another. For he does not know the Secrets of Mens Hearts immediately and of himself, but because God reveales 'em to him. This is all that subtilty could invent in this case: and yet after all there is so little Reason in it, that it destroys it self. For, *First*, when a Person attribute to himself a Quality, that makes him evidently suspected

to usurp the Glory which does not belong to him, he is oblig'd to explain himself by removing the Equivocation of the Term: otherwise he renders himself guilty of Robbery. Thus, if any one should have a mind to be honour'd with a Title of Majesty, upon pretence that he is promoted to some considerable Place in the World, (without being King however) he would thereby commit a Capital Crime against the Prince whose Glory he did Usurp. Though he should say that when he makes himself to be call'd by the Title of Majesty, he does not affix to that Title the Idea which other Men affix to it; and that he understands by it no more than a subordinate and a dependant Majesty: he would be told that his excuses are too indifferent to be received; that as the Term of Majesty is by common Use, and the Will and Pleasure of Sovereign Powers, appropriated to express the Sovereign Dignity of Kings, whereby they are not only distinguish'd from other Men, but also from other Princes; he could not without Offence attribute this Title to himself, much less without giving the least Explication of it. Which last is such a Degree of Temerity and Insolence as is altogether insupportable. So likewise is the Title of *Searcher of Hearts* by common Usage and Authority appropriated to express the Peculiar and Essential Glory of God. It is appropriated, I say, to that Sence by common and Universal Usage. For no Body ever yet attributed it to any but to God; and Believers look upon it as the Peculiar Character by which God is separated from his Creatures, and exalted above all other Intelligences whatever. It is also established by Authority, and that by such an Authority as is sacred and Divine; seeing it is God himself that ascribes it by the Ministry of

A Treatise concerning the

knowest the Hearts of the Children of Men. In which Words he says Two Things: *First* that God knoweth the Hearts of the Children of Men: and Secondly, that he *alone* knoweth them. From whence it follows that the title of *Searcher of Hearts* is comprehended in the proper Idea given us by the Prophets of the God of Israel. And yet Jesus Christ ascribes this Glorious Title to himself, and that in a most Remarkable and solemn manner. *And all the Churches, saith he, shall know that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts: and I will give unto every one according to their Works*

Rev. 2.23.

It follows therefore, that he ascribes to himself not only the Name of God, but also those Attributes which form the most proper Idea of him given us by the Prophets. And if so, then indeed Jesus Christ the God of *Israel*, or the *Jews* are oblig'd to look upon his Language as Impious and full of Blasphemy. What answer can we make to this Objection of theirs?

It will be told 'em, that Jesus Christ does not take this Title of *Searcher of Hearts* in the same Sence that God took it in the Antient Oracles: that God is said to know the Heart and to try the Reins, it ought to be understood of such a Knowledge as is peculiar to him. For he knoweth of himself, and without the help and assistance of any other. Whereas when Jesus Christ saith that he tryeth the Heart and the Reins, this is understood of such a Knowledge, as is receiv'd from another. For he does not know the Secrets of Mens Hearts immediately and of himself, but because God reveales 'em to him. This is all that subtilty could invent in this case: and yet after all there is so little Reason in it, that it destroys it self. For, *First*, when a Person attribute to himself a Quality, that makes him evidently suspected

to usurp the Glory which does not belong to him, he is oblig'd to explain himself by removing the Equivocation of the Term: otherwise he renders himself guilty of Robbery. Thus, if any one should have a mind to be honour'd with a Title of Majesty, upon pretence that he is promoted to some considerable Place in the World, (without being King however) he would thereby commit a Capital Crime against the Prince whose Glory he did Usurp. Though he should say that when he makes himself to be call'd by the Title of Majesty, he does not affix to that Title the Idea which other Men affix to it; and that he understands by it no more than a subordinate and a dependant Majesty: he would be told that his excuses are too indifferent to be received; that as the Term of Majesty is by common Use, and the Will and Pleasure of Sovereign Powers, appropriated to express the Sovereign Dignity of Kings, whereby they are not only distinguish'd from other Men, but also from other Princes; he could not without Offence attribute this Title to himself, much less without giving the least Explication of it. Which last is such a Degree of Temerity and Insolence as is altogether insupportable. So likewise is the Title of *Searcher of Hearts* by common Usage and Authority appropriated to express the Peculiar and Essential Glory of God. It is appropriated, I say, to that Sence by common and Universal Usage. For no Body ever yet attributed it to any but to God; and Believers look upon it as the Peculiar Character by which God is seperated from his Creatures, and exalted above all other Intelligences whatever. It is also established by Authority, and that by such an Authority as is sacred and Divine; seeing it is God himself that ascribes it by the Ministry of

his Prophets to himself, that ascribes it to himself upon several different Occasions; as agreeing to himself alone; and as making a peculiar and an essential Character of his Glory. It follows therefore, that no other but God could usurp it without Offence, much less without our explaining in the least the Sence he took it in. *All the Churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts; and I will give unto every one according to his Works.* We see that in these Words he joyns the Quality of Judge of the World with the Quality of Searcher of Hearts, even as the Prophets did, whenever they attributed them to God. We know also that to render to every one according to his Works, it is necessary to search the Hearts and Reins. But we can never find that God knoweth the Secrets of the Heart, of himself, and that Jesus Christ does not know them immediatly too. Besides that, it is very remarkable that the Apostles are so far from attributing to Jesus Christ the knowledge of the secrets of the Heart in this respect only, in that they are reveal'd to him by God; that they attribute to him this particular knowledge, in that they attribute to him the knowledge of all things in General. *Lord, saith St. Peter, Thou knowest all Things: Thou knowest that I Love thee.* Now for a person to know the secrets of the Heart, because God reveals them to him, is to know them only as Man, but for him to know the secrets of the Heart, because he knows all Things, this is indeed to know 'em as God. And this last knowledge is no other than what is attributed to Jesus Christ. Indeed it might be added in the *Third Place*, that if to know the secrets of the Heart by Revelation, were sufficient to merit the Title of *searcher of Hearts*, the Apostles themselves might have pretended to the Glo-

ry of this Title. For among so many Miraculous Gifts which they had received from the holy spirit, this also is reckon'd viz, the Gift of knowing the secrets of the Heart. This is what St. Paul supposes, when in the 13 Chap. of the 1 Epistle to the *Corinthians*, he tells them that *though he had the Gift of Prophecie, and understood all Misteries, &c. and had not Charity, it profited him nothing.* Now this Gift was in some much more perfect than it was in others, wherefore let us suppose with St. Paul, that some body had it in the highest degree of Perfection, and that he knew all secrets in General. I would fain know whether such a Man could have pretended to the Title of *the searcher of Hearts*. If it be said, He could, the Assertion is Blasphemous, since the Praises which are appropriated to God and Jesus Christ are thereby attributed to another. And if it be said, He could not, our Adversaries do tacitly agree with us, that whosoever utters these words, *the searcher of Hearts*, means somewhat more than the knowing the Heart by Revelation. Perhaps 'twill be Answer'd that how perfect soever we suppose the knowledge of this Man to be, who knoweth the secrets of the Heart, yet the knowledge of Jesus Christ will be still more perfect: which is sufficient to hinder him from ever pretending in that respect to the same Titles with Jesus Christ. But if the knowledge of this Man gives place to that of Jesus Christ, the knowledge of Jesus Christ in this respect gives place much more to that of God. As then this Man ought not to attribute to himself the Title of *the searcher of Hearts* out of respect for Jesus Christ, so ought Jesus Christ much less to attribute it to himself out of respect for God, which has confirmed this Thought, viz. that the knowledge of Jesus Christ and the knowledge of this Man differ but
in

in degree : as being both of the same Kind. For They are *both* acquir'd, and spring from Revelation; whereas the knowledge of Jesus Christ and the knowledge of God will be found to differ in kind : for that, God knows the Heart immediately and of himself, whereas Jesus Christ is supposed to know it only by Revelation. If then this Man whom we suppose to know the secrets of the Heart, cannot signifie to the Churches that he is the searcher of the Reins and Hearts, without usurping the Glory of Jesus Christ, have we not also reason to say that Jesus Christ could not assume this Title which is appropriated to God in these words, *Thou*, even *thou alone knowest the hearts of the Children of Men*, without usurping the Glory of the supreme God? Observe *Fourthly*, the Difference there is between knowing the secret of the Heart, and being the searcher of the Heart. He that is the searcher of the Heart does necessarily know the secret of the Heart : but it is not necessary that he, who know the secrets of the Heart, should be also the searcher of the Heart. Some will say of a Man, to whom the Thoughts of another are reveal'd, that he knows the *heart* of another, though perhaps he'll avoid speaking so generally, that he mayn't be suspected of Impiety, and will say, if he speaks wisely and piously that he knows it by Revelation : but he'll never say that he tries the Reins and Hearts, or that he is the searcher of *his* Heart, whose thoughts are reveal'd to him ; for that 'twould be False. The Terms of, knowing the Heart, of trying the Reins ; of being the searcher of the Thoughts, do not signifie to know by Revelation, but to know, try and discover of ones self what lay before conceal'd. This is the Force of the Word in the Original.

Jesus Christ when he speaks after this Manner, would have us keep to the Natural signification of his Words, or he would have us go from it. If he would have us go from it, it must follow that he has laid a Snare for us, and had a design to deceive us. For, what is it else but to design to deceive us, for him to talk so as he cannot be Understood : and how is it possible for him to be Understood, when he expects we should not take his Expressions in their Natural Signification? But if Jesus Christ expected we should keep to the Natural Sence of the Terms, it is impossible for us, if we do so, to take, *knowing the secrets of the Heart by Revelation, and being the Searcher of the Heart and the Thoughts*, for one and the same Thing.

Thirdly The Prophets had given this Idea of the Supreme God, that he was the Saviour, and the Only Saviour of the Earth. To this purpose do's *Esaiah* express himself, when he says, *Look unto me all the Ends of the Earth, and ye shall be saved. For, I am the Lord, and there is none else.* Which is evidently to say, there is no other Lord to save you. I confess the Prophet here alludes to the Idols of the Heathen, which were unable to save those that put their trust in them : But yet, that does not hinder the Establishment of this General principle, that 'tis God alone, who is able to save the Ends of the Earth. And to put it beyond all question, we need only consider those Words of God speaking by the same Prophet : *Am not I the Lord? And is there any other God besides me? There is no other God, that is Righteous and able to save, except my self.* Now Jesus Christ does not only pretend to save Man, but he calls himself the Saviour by way of Eminence. Can we forbear owning that he attributes to himself a Title, which the God of *Israel* had

re-

reserv'd for himself alone? No, doubtless, we shall grant it, if we make never so serious Reflection thereupon. For I ask whether the Prophets, who to confound the Superstition and Idolatry of those that put their Trust in Idols, advanced this Principle, that there was no other Saviour but the God of *Israel*, whether, I say, they meant to speak so once for All, or purely for the time that then was? If they spoke only for the Time that then was, it follows that the Reasons which God then made use of to confound Idolaters with, are no longer True and Just: And that an Oracle becomes False at the very time precisely, when it is accomplisht. For this Oracle, *Look unto me all ye Ends of the Earth, and be saved, &c. For I am the Lord and there is none else*, signifying the Calling of the Gentiles, is accomplisht, but since the appearance of the Messias: And yet 'tis since the Appearance of the Messias, that there is another Saviour and Lord besides the God of *Israel*, who spoke in that Oracle. Thus would it follow from thence, that the Oracle would become False, at the very time precisely, when it is fulfil'd. But if the Prophets have spoken One for All, and this Principle be Everlastingly True: That *there is no other God that is Righteous and able to save, but the God of Israel*: I ask how we could excuse our selves from looking upon him as a Blasphemer, who being not the God of *Israel*, does yet call himself a God righteous and able to save, or rather the Saviour of the World, and One that saves the Ends of the Earth? I know it will be said, He calls himself a Subordinate Saviour. But then I ask further, what God means when he says, *There is no other God righteous, and that saveth except my self*? Does he not mean to exclude Subordinate Gods and Saviours

viours? And if at that time the Humour had taken any one to look upon a Prophet, or upon Moses the Greatest of Prophets, as a Subordinate God and Saviour, by whose Ministry God has redeem'd his People, and to worship him after his Death for that very reason: could not this Superstitious Person be corrected by the same Principle so generally exprest, *There is no other God righteous, and that saveth but the God of Israel?* It is therefore True, that the Prophets meant to exclude all Subordinate Saviours and Gods; it being in this rank that the greatest Part of False Gods of the Heathen were: and it is true, that the Sense of the Prophets was, that we ought to acknowledge but one God and Saviour; even the God of *Israel*, or the Supreme God; and consequently he without that being the Supreme God, calls himself the God and Saviour of the whole Earth, does not only assume the Name of God, but also the most peculiar Idea fixt upon it by the Ancient Oracles.

Fourthly, The Prophets to distinguish the Supreme God from all other (for 'tis the Supreme God, and no other they speak of) do call him *The First and the Last*: and every Body knows that Jesus Christ assumes this Title no less than five times in the Book of the *Revelation*. Now, to demonstrate that Jesus Christ hereby attributes to himself such Qualities as form the Idea that's peculiar to the Supreme God, we need only consider that the Prophets have given this Title to the Supreme God, as a Title that's peculiar to him, and incommunicable to all others Which appears by several Reasons. As *First*, it is agreed on all Hands that till Jesus Christ, this Title was never given to any other but the Supreme God. It was therefore become peculiar to the Supreme God by Custom, *Secondly*, there is no question

question to be made, but that if any had usurp'd it before Jesus Christ he wou'd have been tax'd with Impiety. Therefore this Title must needs have been lookt upon as being peculiar to the Supreme God. *Thirdly*, it cannot be deny'd but that if any Person should have a fancy to take it at this Day, he would be accus'd of Blasphemy. From whence it follows further, that we must in spite of our Teeth acknowledge that this Title is appropriated to God. Perhaps, it will be said, that if any Person should take it at this Day, he would be guilty of Impiety, because he would wrong Jesus Christ to whom it belongs. But if he wrong'd Jesus Christ he must wrong God much more, to whom it principally belongs. And then, if the Man that should usurp it at this Day, would wrong Jesus Christ: He that usurp'd it before the coming of Jesus Christ must have wrong'd the Supreme God. From whence it invincibly follows, that in spite of our Teeth we are always oblig'd to look upon this Title as being appropriated to the Supreme God. *Fourthly*, this Title is placed among the Praises of God, and in those passages where God designs to advance his Glory, and his Sovereign Majesty. Now, if this Title does not promote the Design, why is it mingled with the touches of those pompous and magnificent Descriptions of God's Glory. And if this Title serves to express the Majesty, Grandeur and Glory of God, cannot it be truly said that it is in a particular manner appropriated to the Supreme Being, and is not to be usurp'd without Blasphemy? Nay further, it is so confounded with those other Attributes which are so peculiar to the Supreme God, that except we make Non-sence of the finest Oracles of the Prophets, it is impossible for us to distinguish it from 'em. For
some

Sometimes it is said with his Power, as when 'tis said, *Who is he that hath wrought and done this? 'Tis he that calleth the Generations from the Beginning, I am the Lord, the First and the Last, It is I.* Sometimes, 'tis put with the Characters of his Grandeur and Majesty: as when the Prophet speaks after this manner, *Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, their Redeemer, the Lord, the God of Hosts: I am the First and the Last, and there is no other God beside me: And who is Like unto me.* You see that after God had said *I am the First and the Last*, He adds, *who is Like unto me?* to let us know that none but himself possesses the Majesty and Glory, which is contain'd in this Title, and the rest that accompany it. And at other times he blinks the Glory of this Title with the wonder of the Creation, to attribute to himself both together: as when he sayes *Hearken unto me O Jacob; and thou, O Israel, whom I call: I am the First and the Last, and my Hand hath laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c.* Fifthly God makes use of this Title to express his Unity by. For thus he expounds it, *There hath been no God form'd before me, neither shall there be any after me.* But if this Title were not peculiar to God, how could it carry in it his Unity when Jesus Christ calls himself the First and the Last, he either takes this Title in the same sense the Prophets took it in, or he takes it in another sense. If in another sense then he leads Men by Captious words into Errour and Idolatry; he is guilty of Blasphemy, because he ascribes to himself in an absolute manner, a Title which does not agree to him but with a Restriction; he alters by his own Authority the Signification of Terms consecrated by a Divine Use; he does what never any Man did since the Creation of the World, viz. change the known ordinary Signi-

Signification of Terms without giving us the least notice of it; and lastly he opens the door of Impiety and Blasphemy to the whole World. For, as he attributes to himself such Titles as are comprehended in the Praise of the supreme God, by changing mentally the known Signification of Words of the old Testament: there is nothing can hinder me from attributing to my self after his example, those Titles that are comprehended in the Praise of Jesus Christ, by changing mentally, according to my Fancy, the most known Signification of the Expressions of the New Testament. But if Jesus Christ in calling himself *the First*, and *the Last*, takes these Terms in the same sense the Prophets took them in, it follows that he describes himself by a Title, which the Prophets made use of to express the Unity, Glory, and Majesty of God: and that Jesus Christ by assuming that Title, hinders it from belonging any longer to the God of *Israel* to whom the Prophets had ascrib'd it: and consequently, the Language of the Prophets is False and Contradictory. For, if the God of *Israel*, is the God, before and after whom no other God has been Form'd: How can Jesus Christ be God, and a God too, before and after whom no other God has been Form'd? Certainly, either Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, or Jesus Christ cannot attribute to himself this Title without Blasphemy, because this Title is part of the true and proper Idea which the Prophets have given us of the supreme Being. We need not add here, that supposing Jesus Christ is But a mere Man, we cannot apprehend, nor indeed so much as guess, in what Sense this Title could belong to him. For, either it is meant of a Priority and Posteriority of *Time*, (which Terms, tho' Barbarous may

may, 'tis hop'd, be allow'd me in a Case so difficult, as is that before us) or 'tis meant of a Priority and Posteriority of *Dignity*; or lastly, 'tis meant of both: And take which of the three you will, this Title can never belong to Jesus Christ as mere Man. For, if it be meant of a Priority and Posteriority of Times, then the sense of those words is this: I am the *First* in *Duration*, and the *Last* in *Duration*. But how can Jesus Christ be said to be the First in *Duration*, when he was form'd in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary* in the Fulness of Time? If it be meant of a Priority and Posteriority of Dignity, then the sense of those words can be no other than this: I am the First and the Last in Dignity. But how can Jesus Christ be the Last in Dignity, when he is Perfection it self, and is so much rais'd above the Prophets, that *John* the Baptist, who was the Greatest of the Prophets, did not think himself worthy to loose the Latchet of his Shoes? But if it be explain'd of both these Priorities and Posteriorities, either the sense of the words will be this: I am the First in Time, and the Last in Dignity; and then the Proposition is false, or 'twill be this: I am the First in Dignity, and the Last in Time; and then the Proposition is false still. For, how is Jesus Christ the Last in Time? Is he the Last of Men? No, for there were several men Born after him. Is he the Last of God's Servants. No, for several Prophets and Apostles of the New Covenant came after him. Or *Lastly*, the sense of those words must be this: I am the First and the Last in Time and in Dignity: which is false still. For, if Jesus Christ is not the First and the Last in Time; nor the First and the Last in Dignity; it is doubly false to say, that He is the First and the Last in time and in

G

Dignity

Dignity both together. But, our Business here is not with the Truth of Jesus Christ's words, but with the Impression which these words might and ought to make upon those that were instructed by the Prophets. We maintain therefore, that hearing Jesus Christ call himself so frequently and so zealously, *The First and the Last*, they could think no otherwise but that he usurp'd One of the most peculiar Titles of the Supreme Being.

Which consideration will appear so much the more forcible, if we collect all those Great Titles, by which God describes his Glory in the Oracles of the Prophets; namely, the Titles of God, the Lord, the Saviour, the Redeemer of *Israel*, the God that saveth the Ends of the Earth and to whom the Ends of the Earth are to look that they may be saved, the God that made the Worlds, or that calleth the Generations, he that is the First and the Last, by whom all things were made, and that tryeth the Reins and Hearts. For here Two things are very manifest. *First*, that all these Names do form the Idea which the Prophets give us of the Supreme God. *Secondly*, and Consequentially upon the *First*, whoever ascribes to himself all these Glorious and Magnificent Titles, and withal calls himself God, does evidently take the Name of God not in an Equivocal, nor in a Metaphorical Sense but in the Sense and Idea which the Prophets have affixt to it: So that he becomes guilty of the Impiety of Men, if they chance to take him falsely for the Supreme God. Either then the *Jews* were to blame for opposing Impiety, Idolatry, and Blasphemy, or they could not avoid the passing Sentence of Condemnation upon Jesus Christ if he spake as his Disciples now speak and as they now make him speak; or how

ever they could not avoid declaring against his Disciples, his Gospel, and his Religion, which were so evidently convicted of Blasphemy. But as we have before shew'd, that Jesus Christ call'd himself God in the most proper sense, because he has ascrib'd to himself the most peculiar Titles of God, we shall in the next Chapter shew, that the Apostles have applyed to Jesus Christ the proper Idea of God, by representing him as Equal with his Father: Which can be said no of other but of him, who is truly and properly God.

CHAP. IV.

A Third Proof taken from Jesus Christ's being made Equal with God.

ST. Paul makes no scruple of saying, that Jesus Christ thought it no Robbery to be Equal with his Father. Now we shall see, in the sequel of this Discourse, the Vanity and Falsity of those shifts which some are put to, who would give this Expression, *He thought it no Robbery*, very violent Explications. But, which way soever we understand this Phrase, we shall still be allowed to suppose, that there is attributed to Jesus Christ some kind of Equality with his Father, who is most undoubtedly the Supreme God. Perhaps some will say, that no Conclusion can be made from one single Expression; which besides, ought not to be taken altogether in the rigour of the Letter: because there are Examples to be found of the like Expression; that

does not signifie such an Equality with God as is strictly and properly so call'd : one of which Examples is read in *Homer* a Heathen Author. But all this is nothing to the purpose. For, *First*, it is very unbecoming to quote an Example out of *Homer*. It is Notorious that the Writings of the Heathens, and especially the Writings of the Poets, do abound with Impiety and Blasphemies which is the very thing that inhances the Book of the Scripture, whose Character it is, to distinguish infinitely God from the Creature, by never attributing to the Creature what may belong to God ; 'tis that, I say, which inhances them above all Humane Books, where sometime God is confounded with Men, and at other times Men are exalted above God. 'Tis observable that he who makes use of this way of speaking is *St. Paul*, that is to say, a man that seems to attribute the most to the Grace, and to refer all to the Glory of God. *We have*, says he, *the Treasure in earthen Vessels, that it may appear the Excellency of this power cometh from God, and not from us.* Now a Man that is on his Guard to avoid attributing to Second Causes any thing of the Praise, which belongs to God, will take care not to use rashly any expression that associates the Creator with the Creature, by making the Creature Equal with the Creator. *Thirdly*, that you mayn't think this expression dropt from him by chance, Consider it is conceived in a very particular manner, and is false as does not naturally fall into a Man's Mind. But here perhaps 'tis an Hyperbole. If it is 'tis an Hyperbole that touches the Glory of God. When upon strict examination, we have nothing else to charge an Hyperbole with, but a want of Truth ; this is very inconsiderable. But, we must have no reason to charge it with

being Impious and Blasphematory. Thus the Scripture never says, that a Man is Good, Wise, Powerful, &c. as God is, least these Terms should make an Impression contrary to the Glory of this Supreme Being. This is what the Writers of the Old Testament have avoided with a great deal of care : and the Writers of the *New* ought to avoid it with a much greater, because it was said, that under this Covenant all Things should be Abased, and God be highly Exalted.

But, to be short, I shall here confine my self to Three Principal Considerations.

The *First* is, that God had solemnly declared by the mouth of his Prophets, that not any Thing was like him. This he spoke, not only Once or Twice, but he had repeated it a thousand Times. The manner he express it in, was proper and sufficient to confound Idolatry. This he made the Grand Principle of his Religion : Which St. Paul very well knew ; having read the Ancient Oracles over and over. And yet St. Paul durst answer that Voice from Heaven, *Who is like unto me ?* by saying boldly, that Jesus Christ *Thought it no Robbery to be Equal with this Great God*.

My *Second* Consideration is, that this Apostle could not but know the Reason, or if you please, the Pretence for which Jesus Christ had been first Accused and condemned by the *Jews* ; namely, because he made himself Equal and like unto God. Which was a prodigious Offence to Men that had heard God say by his Prophets, *Who is like unto me ?* St. Paul does what he can to bring the *Jews* into the Christian Church : but instead of justifying the Christian Religion from the Crime of Equalling the Creature with the Creator even at time when 'twere so necessary both for the Salvation of Mankind, and

the Glory of God, he declares, that Jesus Christ thought it no Robbery to be Equal with God. The same Man, that rents his Garments, when upon another Occasion he is taken for Mercury (who is a Subordinate God among the Heathens) durst he equal a mere Creature with the Supreme God? Are not not his Hyperboles very Edifying? Does not he take a fine time to utter them in? and does it not well become him to pretend to set up for an Oratour at the Expence of Piety and the Glory of God?

Thirdly, and *Lastly*, we say, that the other Expressions of the Apostles are a true Comment upon this; and that as the Disciples of Jesus Christ do not only attribute to him the Name of God but also give him the Name and the Idea which the Prophets have affixt to it; and as the Apostles give such Titles to Jesus Christ, as cannot belong to him, except he is indeed equal with God: We are not to question but St. Paul takes the Expression here in a Proper and Literal Sense.

In a Word, either this Expression is adopted by the Christians, or it is not. If it be not, they must think that St. Paul spoke very ill; and that they overthrow a Fundamental Principle of their Religion, which is, that St. Paul was inspir'd by the Holy Spirit. But if this Expression be adopted by 'em, it follows that we may believe that the rest of the Disciples spoke after the same manner: and if so, we will ask them whether the Jews who heard the Apostles speaking thus, were not in the right to call them Impious and Blasphemers, when on one side they saw that Jesus Christ was but a mere Creature, and on the other side that he was made equal to the Supreme God.

There are four Judgments which the *Jews* could reasonably make in this Case. They judge, *First*, that Jesus Christ is a meer Creature : which is granted. *Secondly*, that a Creature cannot, without Impiety, be said to be equal with God : Which is what God himself teaches us, *Who is like unto me ? Or, to whom will ye liken me ?* *Thirdly*, that the Disciples of Jesus Christ, do equal the Creature to the Creator : Which appears by the Expression of St. *Paul*. And, *Fourthly*, that the Disciples of Jesus Christ ought to be condemned of Blasphemy : Which last Judgment is a just and natural Conclusion from the Three Former. When God saith, *Who is like unto me ?* he does not mean to exclude all manner of Resemblance in general : for he does not exclude a Resemblance of Conformity and Analogy, we being like unto God, who is, who acts, who thinks, in that *we* are, *we* act and *we* think : But his design is to exclude a Resemblance of Equality. And this is exactly the same which you chuse to attribute to a Creature when you say, that Jesus Christ *thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*. For, either you attribute to him a Resemblance of Equality, or you attribute to him a Resemblance of Analogy, which last consists in some Conformity to God more or less according as there are more or less Degrees of Perfection. If you ascribe to him this Resemblance of Analogy only, you say nothing : Thus Men and Angels are like unto God ; and yet not one of either could or ought to express himself after this manner. And then, 'twould be absurd to say in this Sence, We think it no Robbery to be equal or like unto God. It remains therefore, that you ascribe to him a Resemblance of Equality, according to the Truth and Force of the Expression. For, sometimes the Word *Equal*

is very well exprest by *Like*; as when the Prophets say, *To whom will ye make me like?* But *like*, when 'tis taken for *resembling*, *conformable*, is never exprest by *Equal*. Man is like to God in this Resemblance of Analogy, because he bears his Image: However, we don't say that Man is therefore equal with God: It cannot be said here that this Equality is *Figurative* and *Metaphorical*. For that would be weak. That Jesus Christ thought it no Robbery to be equal with God by a Figure and a Metaphor, is a Proposition absurd and ridiculous. And then Figures become Impious, when on one side they were never us'd, and on the other they present a Sense that's contrary to God's Glory. In short, as the Jews were not blameable for speaking like other Men, especially like the Prophets of God who had instructed them, so neither are they blameable for thinking that none can be said to be equal with God, except he be God, or except he wrong God. Nor can they help thinking that the Disciples hold to this Language of Jesus Christ. For to what purpose do the Disciples speak after this manner, if they would not have this Language be ascrib'd to them. Perhaps you will say, that they explain themselves well enough upon other Occasions: And we maintain, First, that though they should explain themselves ten thousand times, yet this Proposition would be never the less contrary to the Glory of God, *viz. There is some Creature or other, which cannot think it any Robbery to be Equal with God.* I maintain further, that they pull down with one Hand, what they build up with another. In short, if Jesus Christ be not equal with God, and if it be a Sin to think so, why should we say so? For what was this Expression needful? For the Glory of God? No, on the contrary, it villifies the Deity, at least if

we affix the Idea which Men have always affix'd to it. Was it then needful for to exalt Jesus Christ? But cannot he be exalted without putting him upon the Level with the Supreme God? Was it to show the Truth and Accomplishment of the Ancient Oracles? But these Oracles had so often declar'd, that there was but one only God, and that there was nothing like him. Was it to edify Men? But can Men be edify'd by seeing a Creature made equal to the Supreme God? St. Peter and St. Paul, are the Disciples of Jesus Christ, his Ministers, his Embassadors, and without doubt, they have the first place in the Church next to Jesus Christ. And yet, if St. Peter or St. Paul told us, *I think it no Robbery to be equal with Jesus Christ*, we should call him a Blasphemer. God, the Supreme God, is infinitely more exalted above Jesus Christ, than Jesus Christ is above any of his Apostles. If therefore this Apostle would be accus'd of Impiety if he call'd himself equal with Jesus Christ, then ought Jesus Christ to be accus'd of the same, if he is so bold to say, that *He thought it no Robbery to be equal with God*.

CHAP. V.

A Fourth Proof taken from Jesus Christ's causing himself to be Worshipp'd.

BUT for the better proving, that the Disciples made Jesus Christ equal to God, and that Jesus Christ made himself equal to the Supreme Being in the most proper Sence; we shall not be content with having observ'd, that he

has

has ascrib'd to himself those Names and Titles, which were appropriated to the Supreme God, but shall shew further, that he has pretended to the very same Worship.

Certain it is, that God, and none but God, is to be ador'd. Whenever Men have pretended to this Adoration, they have thereby pretended to be Gods : And when they have not pretended to be Gods, they have not pretended to Adoration.

Therefore, though we had never known before this, that Jesus Christ expects to be look'd upon as God, we could in no wise have question'd it ; when we see that he requires Men to pay him this Adoration. The Evangelists relate, that after his Birth he was worshipt first by the Sheperds of *Betlehem*, and afterwards by the Wise Men. Which Worship is not to be imputed to him at a time when he seem'd to be in a condition to hinder it. But these same Evangelists inform us, that he was several times worshipt during his Life ; and they add, that it is not only lawful to worship him, but, also, that all the Angels of God were commanded to pay him that Homage.

If Jesus Christ be the Supreme God, he is in the right to make himself Worshipt. But if he be not the Supreme God, we cannot without a kind of Sacrilege, pay him that Worship, which is due to God, and to him alone. Certainly, though the rest were tollerable, this could in no wise be so, since he exalts himself as Supreme God, not only by his Words, but also by his Actions.

A Man, for the purpose, that should have the Confidence to take the Name of King, though he were a Subject in a State, where a rightful Sovereign was acknowledged, would certainly be very guilty. But he would be
much

much more so, if he dar'd to take those Titles, which were appropriated to signifie the Grandure of his Master : as if when in *France*, he would assume the Title of King of *France*, *Navarre*, &c. or when in *Hungary*, he should call himself King of *Bohemia*, *Hungary*, &c. But he would be still more Guilty, if besides all this he made himself treated truly and properly as Prince, if he exacted the Titles of Majesty : and made himself serv'd, as do some Kings in their Dominions, upon the Knee. In this case there would be no way to dissemble such an Outrage, and either the Allegiance due to a Rightful King must be renounced, or this Man be call'd Usurper and guilty of High Treason.

The *Jews* may be said to have had Two Reasons for one, to treat Jesus Christ so. First, the respect and faithfulness which they owe to the Supreme God, would not suffer them to allow a mere Man, or Creature, to usurp the Homage due to the Supreme God alone : then the Obedience which they ought to the Law, did not allow them to have any other Gods before the Lord.

To which, there are but Three Things can be answer'd. We must either deny that Worship is an Homage peculiar to the Supreme God ; or we must say that Jesus Christ did not pretend to make himself worshipt ; or, lastly, we must pretend that Jesus Christ did not mean to be worshipt in the same Sence and Manner as the Supreme God. And yet there is nothing of all this can be said with any Foundation, or just Ground.

For, if we say, that Worship is not an Homage peculiar to the Supreme God, I ask, whether any One was ever worshipt besides the Supreme

preme God? Perhaps, some will answer, that the Angel which appear'd to the Patriarchs, and afterwards to *Moses*, was Worshipt though but a mere Creature. But this is to suppose a thing, which is very much doubted. For the Angel which was Worshipt first by the Patriarchs, and afterwards by the *Israelites* at the Foot of Mount *Sinai*, is the Supreme God, because he is *the Lord Possessor of Heaven and Earth, the Dread of Isaac, and the Judge of the whole Earth*; in whose Presence *Abraham* acknowledges himself to be *but Dust and Ashes*; who says of himself, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*; and who pronounces these Words to the People of *Israel* when prostrated before him in the Plain, *I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt &c.* It is the Angel of the Lord, that says, out of the midst of the Bush: *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*; which are the very Words of the Scripture. So that the Christians can no longer doubt whether he that spake thus, were at the same time the Supreme God, they having heard Jesus Christ draw this Consequence from that Passage, *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living*; and by Consequence to acknowledge, that he who spake in the Bush, was the Supreme God. He is then the Angel of the Lord according to the Text; the Supreme God according to Jesus Christ, and both according to us.

Again, an Homage that's peculiar and appropriated to God, is such an Homage as was never given by Believers to any but to God. *Worship* was never given by Believers to any but God. Therefore *Worship* is an Homage peculiar and appropriated to God. Further, an Homage, which cannot be given to a Creature without Idolatry, is an Homage peculiarly appropriated to God. But *Worship* is such an Homage. As appears from the

Divinity of Jesus Christ.

93

the Idolatry of the Gentiles, which consisted in paying this Homage to others besides the True God.

And here 'twill be said (as is commonly reply'd in this Case) that we must distinguish a Two-fold Worship: One is what I shall call *Subordinate*, because 'tis render'd to Subordinate Beings; and the other is what we shall call *Supreme*, because 'tis given to none but to the Supreme God. To which I answer, First, that this Distinction is good for nothing, because 'tis an easie Matter to know, that Jesus Christ caus'd Supreme Worship to be paid him. Which may be shew'd by distinguishing a Three-fold Worship: One of Thought, another of Word, another of Action. He that would have us think of him as we do of the Supreme God, makes himself to be Worship'd as the Supreme God. But Jesus Christ would have us think of him as we do of the Supreme God. Which I prove thus: Jesus Christ attributes to himself to be equal with the Supreme God; he further attributes to himself his Properties, Omnipotence, Omniscience, &c. Therefore, he would have us think of him, as we ought to think of the Supreme God. Secondly, He that talks of himself as of the Supreme God, or that impowers others to do so, would be acknowledged for Supreme God, and be Worshipt as such. But Jesus Christ speaks, or would be spoken of by us as of the Supreme God. This appears from his taking the Names of God. For, what need was there to take them else? It appears further from his attributing to himself the Properties and Works of God. He says, that all Things were made by him; or at least the Apostles say so for him. In a word, he that expects that should be done for him, which was never done for any but for the Supreme

preme God, expects to be Worshipt as the Supreme God. But Jesus Christ expects we should do that for him ; which we ought not to do for any but the Supreme God. Thus, we are to love God above all things : but we are not commanded to pay so sublime a Duty to any besides God. We ought also to love Jesus Christ above all things ; more than the dearest thing in the World to us, which is our own Preservation. *If any one, saith he, hateth not his Life for my sake, he is not worthy of me.* We owe to God Sacrifice, and not only the Sacrifice of Goats and Lambs, which is Carnal, and the Character of a Corporal Religion, but chiefly the Sacrifice of our Blood and Lives, which is Spiritual and worthy of a Covenant more perfect than That of the Law. But Jesus Christ expects we should suffer Martyrdom for his sake, and consequently he expects a Duty that was never given to any but to God. St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. James will not tell ye as he does that, *If any one forsaketh not Lands, Wife, Children, nay, and his own Life for my sake and the Gospel, is not worthy of me.* It would be to no purpose to say, that as Jesus Christ is dependent on his Father, when he commands us to forsake our Life for his sake, he means no more then that we should lay it down for God's sake. For, if that were true, nothing could hinder St. Peter and St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles from speaking to us as Jesus Christ, and telling us after his manner, that *If any one hateth not his own Life for my sake, he is not worthy of me.* For, as they would be Inferiour and Dependent with respect to God, it might be likewise said, that He that should strive to do this for the sake of the Apostle who should speak thus, would do it for the sake of God. Perhaps some will tell me, that 'tis enough for Jesus Christ to de-
clare.

clare, that he Acts in the Name of his Father, and that his Father is Greater than He, to prevent our attributing to him truly, a Design to make himself honour'd with Supreme Worship. But I shall prove by an incontestable Instance that That is not enough. Suppose the Minister of a King should be so bold as to issue out Orders under his own Seal for Coining Money with his Image on it, to make himself treated as Majesty, at the same time assuming the Names and Titles of the Sovereign, do you think 'twould excuse him to say, that his Prince is Greater than he, and that he Acts in his Name. Should we not have ground to tell him, that he destroys by his Actions what he advances by his Words, and contradicts himself? The Application is very easie to the Matter in hand. For, as there is a certain Idea of Royalty which Subjects ought never to apply to any besides their Prince; as there are certain Names and Titles so properly belonging, and appropriated to the person of a Sovereign, that they cannot be given without Offence to any other; and as there are certain External Homages, which are pay'd a Sovereign, and cannot be given to others without being guilty of High Treason, with what design, and under what pretence soever we cover ourselves, because Words and Actions do not signifie according to our private Will and Humour, but according to their Nature, or rather the Use Assigned them: so, according to a most Ancient, Sacred and inviolable Use establish'd by the Prophets, and the Language of God himself, there are some Ideas so appropriated to God, that they cannot possibly belong to any other; and there are some Titles so peculiar to God, that 'tis High Treason in a Divine sense to give them to any other; and lastly, there is a
fort

fort of a Worship and Homage so particularly due to God, that under what pretence soever they ought never to be given to another.

We have then shew'd, than when Jesus Christ exacted Worship from Men, this Worship was *Supreme*. But to proceed further. It is said that Subordinate Worship is distinguish'd from Supreme Worship, in that Supreme Worship acknowledges God for the Source of all Being and Perfection; and that Subordinate Worship may be given to Beings proceeded from God, when they have been particularly honoured by him, or have received from him the Empire of the Universe. But it may be said, that this Subordinate Worship was neither known to the Legislator, nor the Prophets, nor Jesus Christ himself, nor to the Apostles. Of all which in Order.

There are Two reasons that perswade us, that Subordinate Worship was unknown to the *Legislator*. First, because he forbids all Worship in General, except what belongs to the Supreme God, and that in a Precept that's Moral, and by consequence ought to stand for an Everlasting Truth, and with perpetual Force. Which he would never have done, had there been any Subordinate Worship Lawful, for fear of insnaring Men by an Equivocation which might lead them into Errour: And he would never have forbidden us in General to worship any other but God, but only to Worship any other but God with a *Supreme* Worship. For, if the Supreme Law-giver design'd Jesus Christ should be One day Worship'd, why does he forbid so generally all manner of Worship but that which is given to God? *Secondly*, because God evidently designed to suppress the Heathen Idolatry. But this Heathen Idolatry did properly consist in Worshipping several Divinities with this Subordinate Wor-

ship

ship. For, they acknowledg'd but one Supreme Being, no less then the *Jews*.

Perhaps 'twill here be told me, that the Law forbids such a Subordinate Worship as terminates upon Idols, and not that which was to terminate upon Jesus Christ: But to no purpose. For, when the Law forbids this Subordinate Worship, it does it in general Terms, which forbid all sort of Subordinate Worship without any Exception. Methinks I hear our Adversaries say, that there are first Idols, and these Idols becoming afterwards the Object of Worship, render that Worship Idolatrous. Whereas, they should say, that here's an Object Worshipt and this Worship being transferr'd to an Object that did not deserve it, renders an Object which was before Innocent in it self, an Idol. God expressing himself in a General manner, and forbidding to Worship after the manner of the Heathens, that is to say, with this Subordinate Worship, any of the Things in Heaven or on Earth, 'tis evident, that as soon as we Worship any One of those Things, which are in Heaven or on Earth, even with this Subordinate Worship, we immediatly make an Idol of it. To conclude, the Commandment does not only say, *Thou shalt have no Other God; but thou shalt have no other God before me*: which seems principally to forbid Subordinate Worship.

I say, secondly, that the *Prophets* were Ignorant of a Subordinate Worship. For, first, they had no such Instance before their Eyes: they never heard talk of it: and they never make mention of it Further, they laugh at these Subordinate Gods, because they can't conceive how a Man can Worship such Gods, as cause not the Rain to descend, and did not make the Heavens and the Earth, &c. which, doubt'less,

H

they

they would never say, if they knew that there is, or that in the Fulness of Time there was to be, a Subordinate and Dependent God, who ought to be Worshipt, even tho' he made not the Rain to descend, and had not Created the Heavens and the Earth. I shall be told, that if the Prophets blaine Idolaters, 'tis because they Worship with a Supreme Worship Gods that Created not the Heavens and the Earth. But if the Holy Spirit had no other reason to complain but that, he would never complain in that respect. For 'tis certain the Heathens did not Worship their Subordinate Divinities with a Supreme Worship: That it to say, they did not look upon 'em as being the Source of Being, and the Original of all Good: In this Quality they had none but their *Jupiter*.

The *Disciples* of Jesus Christ themselves did not know this Distinction of *Subordinate* and *Supreme* Worship; because they believ'd that all Worship, even all External Worship, and which was not accompany'd with the Worship of the Mind, even a Worship, which could in no sense be thought to tend towards a Supreme Object, they thought that all such Worship pay'd to a Creature, did infinite Prejudice to the Interests of the Glory of the Creator. For, when *Cornelius* falls down before *St. Peter*, he does not take *St. Peter* for the Supreme Being. If he Worships him, it is but Outwardly, and not as the Author and Original of all Good. He knew very well that *St. Peter* was but a Man: For the Angel had told him so, when he bid him send for *St. Peter* from *Joppa*. Therefore this Worship can be no more than Subordinate, and indeed very Subordinate. For, observe what *Cornelius* says to him: *Four days ago I was fasting until this hour, and at the ninth hour I prayed in my House*

House, and behold, a Man stood before me in bright Clothing, and said, Cornelius, thy Prayer is heard, and thine Alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God, send therefore to Joppa, and call hither Simon, whose Sir-name is Peter; he is lodged in the House of one Simon a Tanner, by the Sea side, who when he cometh, shall speak unto thee. You see here what might be the Prejudice of Cornelius, when St. Peter came to his House. He lookt upon him not as the Supreme God, but as a Man called Simon, Sur-named Peter, and lodg'd at Joppa in the House of another Simon a Tanner. However, the sacred History informs us, that as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. It is very credible, that the Intention of Cornelius was not in the least to Worship a Man that was sent him from the Supreme God, with the same Worship that was due to the Supreme God. And yet, because Worship, nay external Worship, was an Act determin'd by Custom to express the honour that was given to the Supreme Being, St. Peter did not so much consider the good Intention of Cornelius, as to prevent the doing of that for him, which ought only to be done for God. He takes up Cornelius, Saying, Stand up, I my self also am a Man. From whence we draw Two Invincible Proofs to shew, that 'tis never allow'd to Worship any but the Supreme God. The First is, that St. Peter withstands this Action for the Glory of God, in saying, I am but a Man, I am not God. From whence it appears that Subordinate Worship, as well as all other, is contrary to God's Glory, when 'tis given to any other but Him. Secondly, it appears, from hence, that whosoever is a mere Man by Nature, ought not to pretend to Worship, whether Subordinate or Supreme. In effect, what is it that

hinders *St. Peter* from letting himself be Worshipt upon this Occasion? either 'tis the Respect he has for the Supreme God, or the Respect he has for Jesus Christ. If 'tis the Respect he has for the Supreme God, *St. Peter* must imagine, that Worship, I mean Subordinate Worship, when payed to a Creatures, is prejudicial to the Supreme God: In which Case no only *St. Peter* but Jesus Christ himself is oblig'd. to refuse it. If 'tis the respect he has for Jesus Christ, then *St. Peter* should not have said in refusing the Worship of *Cornelius*, *I also am a Man*: For Jesus Christ whose Glory he is so afraid to prejudice, is also a Man, and no more than a Man by Nature. But, to take things as they should be taken, *St. Peter* here tells *Cornelius* what he is, only to let him know what is due to him from him. He calls himself a Man, to let him know, that whatever pretence Men may make for this kind of Worship, yet God alone is to receive it. If *St. Peter's* Person deserv'd not this Worship, yet the Quality he bare of a Messenger from God deserv'd extraordinary Honours: And 'twas under this Notion that *Cornelius* consider'd him, under this Idea that he offers to Worship him. However *St. Peter* rejects it and that for no other reason but this, *I am also a Man*. And is not this to Establish for a General Principle, that what Title soever a Man is invested with; nay, though he be the Messenger of God, yet he ought not to be Worshipt, if he is merely Man? Perhaps some will here say, that this makes no Conclusion against Jesus Christ. But why not, since the Maxim is general. In short, if the Respect *St. Peter* has for Jesus Christ hinders him from sharing in the Worship of Jesus Christ, methinks the Respect which Jesus Christ ought to have for the Supreme God, should hinder him from

from sharing the Homages of Religion with the Supreme God. Which Jesus Christ must do, at least externally, if this Subordinate Worship were to the Purpose.

We may add, Fourthly, that the *Angels* did not know of this Subordinate Worship, which we here treat of. For, if they did, then the *Angel* that shew'd St. *John* so many Wonders would not have withstood the Worship, which this Apostle would have given him, or at least he would have oppos'd it with other Motives. For, 'tis plain, that St. *John* could not take this Angel for the Supreme God, because the Angel had spoke to him just before in these Terms: *These sayings are faithful and true. And the Lord God of the holy Prophets sent his Angel to shew unto his Servants the things which must shortly be done, &c.* To which St. *John* adds: *When I had heard and seen these things, I fell down to Worship before the feet of the Angel, which shewed me these things. But he saith unto me, see thou do it not: For I am thy fellow servant, and of thy Brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep these sayings: Worship God.* St. *John* would have Worshipt this Angel, because 'twas the Angel of God, and not because he beleived 'twas God himself. However, the Angel not making all these Distinctions, saith unto him, *Worship God: Establishing in the clearest, and most evident manner in the World, that Worship* (what kind soever it be) ought not to be given to any but God. But I shall be told, that the Angel rejects this Subordinate Worship, because he has not Dignity enough to pretend to it, as much Subordinate as it is. But if so, why does he order us to pay this Worship to God alone? *Worship God*, saith He. Certainly, had he known all these Distinctions, he would have been so

far from saying, *See thou do it not, Worship God*; that he would have said, *Take care what Worship thou payst me, and see thou pay it to God*: for thou Worshippest me as the Messenger of God, and not as the infinite Source of God. See thou pay this Worship which thou payest me, unto God; 'tis a Subordinate Worship. But if he had thought it his Duty to reject this Subordinate Worship, as much Subordinate as it was, he would have said, *See thou do it not. Worship Jesus Christ*; for, He alone deserves to be Worshipt with this Subordinate Worship: there being no other but the most High God, that deserves to be serv'd with the Supreme Worship.

I shall proceed farther, and maintain, that when the Devil tempted our Lord Jesus Christ in the Wilderness, he did not know this *Subordinate* Worship. For, when he asks Jesus Christ to Worship him, he does not ask to be Worshipt as Supreme God. For he declares immediately, that there is One greater than He, because he gives to understand that he does not possess the Kingdoms of the World and the Glory thereof Originally; but that all these Things were given him. For, saith he, *all these things were given me, and I give them to whom I will*. The Devil then would be Worshipt with a Subordinate Worship. And Jesus Christ refutes him with this Precept of the Law: *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*. It follows therefore that this Commandment forbids to Worship every other but the True God, whether with a Supreme or a Subordinate Worship: or rather, that this Distinction has no manner of real Foundation.

C H A P. V.

A Fourth Proof taken from the Application that is made to Jesus Christ of the Oracles of the Old Testament, in which are contained the Characters of the Glory of God.

BUT, that which fully convinceth us, and shews us in what Sence, and after what manner the Jews could take the Expressions of the Disciples of Jesus Christ, who endeavour'd to make a God of their Master: 'Tis, that they made no scruple of applying to him the Oracles of the Old Testament, which express the most Essential Characters of his Glory. Of this we have already produc'd several Instances, which we shall examine more particularly hereafter: and our Adversaries themselves do not altogether disagree to 'em; since they pretend that these Oracles are apply'd to Jesus Christ by way of Accommodation and Allusion.

But, 'tis strange, and very surprizing, that the Disciples durst make such Applications to Jesus Christ, if Jesus Christ be not the True God and the Supreme God.

Though they had been instructed only in the School of Nature, that would have been sufficient to teach 'em, not to apply to a Creature such things as were said of the Creator exclusively of the Creatures, as are the Oracles of the Old Testament. For, 'twas never known that Men apply'd such Things to this purpose, without being suspected of Impiety and Profaneness. I know very well, that the Heathens were not very scrupulous in this respect. For they never

fail'd to debase God, and to exalt the Creatures by investing them with the Glory of God : In which the prodigious Excess of their Superstition principally consisted. But their Example ought to have little or no weight with us

But, if you consider the Disciples of Jesus Christ, as having been instructed in the School of the Prophets, 'tis impossible to suspect them of any such Mistake : For, is there any thing comparable to the Wariness of the Prophets in this respect ? They are in a perpetual Jealousie, least the Creator should be confounded with the Creature. And being in this just Apprehension, they take care not to apply the most Essential Characters of the Glory of the Former, unto the Latter.

Moreover, the Descriptions which the Apostles make of Jesus Christ, are certainly no more sacred, than those which the Prophets had made of the Supreme God. As therefore, we should not dare to apply to another the Descriptions of Jesus Christ : methinks the same Reason ought to hinder us from applying to Jesus Christ the Descriptions of the Supreme God.

A Man would be justly charged with Impiety, if he should call an Apostle, St. Peter for Instance, *The only Son of God* ; or the *Lamb of God which taketh away the Sins of the World*, our King, our Prophet, our High-Priest, the *Everlasting High-Priest*, after the Order of Melchisedec, the *Prince of Peace*, the *Father of Eternity*, Emanuel, *God with us*, *Jesus or Saviour*, *Christ or the anointed of God*, the *Eternal Word*, the *Saviour of the World*, the *Holy of Holies*, the *King of the World*, *Alpha and Omega*, the *Beginning and the End*, the *Lion of the Tribe of David*, the *Son of God*, his *only Son*, his *own Son*.

It were Unsufferable for a Man to say of St. Peter, That he has redeemed the Church with his Blood, that he has saved us, that he has redeem'd us, that he has made Expiation for our Sins, that he has born them upon the Cross; that there is new no Condemnation to them which are in St. Peter; and which walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit; that Peter dwelleth in our Hearts by Faith; that there is no other Name but his, whereby we must be saved; that by his Blood he hath broken down the Wall of Partition, and brought us near unto God, when we were as far off; that he has been made unto us by God, Wisdom, Righteousness Sanctification and Redemption; that he was made a Curse for us, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him; that by his Blood, we have Access to the Throne of God; and that by his Death he hath destroy'd him who had the Power of Death, that is the Devil.

Is it not true, that we should look upon a Man that spoke thus of St. Peter, as Impious and a Blasphemer? 'Twould be to little purpose for such a one to tell ye, that Jesus Christ is greater than St. Peter, this would not at all satisfy you; but you would have the more Reason to upbraid him with his own Confession, which condemns him and covers him with Shame, because he thereby openly contradicts himself, and becomes guilty of Impiety after he had acknowledged the Truth.

It would do him but little Service to say, that the Application, which he makes of the Principal Characters and Attributes of Jesus Christ to St. Peter, are made only by way of Allusion, Accommodation, and an Imperfect and Hyperbolic Application, which ought not to be urg'd with rigour. For, you might with good Reason answer, that if 'it is an Allusion,'tis Impious; if

if an Accommodation, 'tis Profane ; and if 'tis an Application, 'tis full of Blasphemy ; seeing that all Allusions, Accommodations, or Applications whatsoever, cannot fail of carrying this Name in them, when they naturally make the same Impression.

But if you consider as Blasphemy the Application which any one should make of the Principal Characters and Attributes of Jesus Christ to a great Apostle as St. Peter ; it must needs be granted, that 'tis a much greater Blasphemy to make Application of the Characters and Attributes of the Supreme Being unto Jesus Christ, if it be certain that Jesus Christ is not One and the Same Essence with him.

Therefore, according to this Supposition, it would be abominably Impious to say, *That he hath laid the Foundation of the Earth, and that the Heavens are the Work of his Hands ; that he tryeth the Reins, and is the Searcher of Hearts ; that he is the Lord, the Eternal, Jehovah, loving Righteousness and hating Iniquity, the God that bringeth Recompence and Salvation, the blessed God, the God that is between the Cherubims in the Sanctuary as in Sinai, the God of our Salvation, the Sovereign ; the Lord that stretcheth forth the Heavens, and layeth the Foundation of the Earth, and formeth the Spirit of Man within him ; the Lord, towards whom the Ends of the Earth are to look, before whom every Knee is to Bow, and to whom every Tongue is to give Praise ; he that calleth the Generations from the Beginning, the Lord, the King of Israel, their Redeemer, the God of Hosts, our Fear and our Dread.* For, 'tis undeniable, that the Apostles give all these Titles to Jesus Christ, by saying, that 'tis he who is describ'd in these Oracles, and whom the Prophets in these lofty and magnificent Descriptions constantly understand.

In Truth, if the Disproportion between Jesus Christ and St. Peter is Great, then that which is between Jesus Christ and the Supreme God is greater, even according to the Principle of our Adversaries; since the former is Bounded and the latter is Infinite: and by Consequence, if the most Essential Characters of the Glory of Jesus Christ cannot without Blasphemy be attributed to St. Peter; the most Essential and most incommunicable Characters of the Glory of God cannot, without an infinitely greater Blasphemy, be apply'd to Jesus Christ.

And this will appear more evident still, if we suppose, secondly, that this Man who should make such Applications to St. Peter, knew that this Question had been debated upon Celebrated Occasions, *whether St. Peter were equal to Jesus Christ*; and that he foresaw this Error would become General in the World, insomuch that for several Ages S. Peter would be confounded with Jesus Christ the Saviour and Redeemer of Mankind. I say, that in this Case, such a Man is guilty of prodigious Impiety, boldly to apply to St. Peter the Characters of Jesus Christ, which are like to be of so dangerous and fatal a Consequence.

Now all this is very easily apply'd to the Apostles: who could not be ignorant that the Question, *Whether Jesus Christ were equal and like to God*, had been already debated; nay, that 'twas under the Colour of this pretended Blasphemy, that the Jews had persecuted Jesus Christ. They who foresaw there would arise false Teachers in the latter Times, and who fully describ'd their Doctrine, were not ignorant, that the Christians would fall into this Error of confounding Jesus Christ with the Supreme God. And if the Apostles foresaw both these Things, how could they

they, without manifest Impiety, apply to Jesus Christ the Oracles of the Old Testament, which express the Glory of the Supreme God, and particularly (as is infinitely remarkable) the Oracles which express the Glory of the Supreme God exclusively to that of his Creatures?

S E C T III.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ be not the true God, of One and the Same Essence with his Father, Jesus Christ and the Apostles have themselves lead us into an Error.

C H A P. I.

Several Ways of Confirming this Truth. And, first, that the Principles we oppose do destroy the Ideas which the Scripture gives us of God's Charity and Benefits.

WE have shew'd, that if Jesus Christ is a mere Creature, the Mahometan Religion is the Re-establishment of the True Religion, and Mahomet to be preferred before Jesus Christ. We have also shew'd, that

Jesus Christ is not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, the *Jews* had good Ground to adhere to the Sentence, which their Forefathers pronounced against him. We are now to defend the Principle which we propos'd to establish in the *Third Place*, viz. that if Jesus Christ is a mere Man, or, if you will, a mere Creature, it must necessarily follow, that both he and his Disciples had design to deceive us and to lead us into Error.

The general Reason which may be given for it, is, that the Sacred Writers have not spoken of Jesus Christ as a mere Creature, though they were perfectly inform'd of what Jesus Christ was, by Jesus Christ himself. This will appear to us beyond all Dispute, when we have made good the following Truths. The *first* is, that this Hypothesis which makes Jesus Christ a mere Creature, and especially that which makes him a mere Man, destroys the Idea which Jesus Christ speaking either by himself or by his Disciples, does give us of God Benefits, his Father's Mercy, or his own Charity. *Secondly*, that this Principle so weakens the Idea which the Scripture gives us of the Greatness of the Mystery of Godliness, that according to this Opinion we can think nothing else but that the Sacred Writers had a Design to deceive us by empty and bombastick Expressions. *Thirdly*, that this Opinion deprives Jesus Christ of all his Honour, by making him to possess Metaphorically the Titles which the Scripture gives him really: So that according to this Principle, the chief Characters of the Glory of the Son of God are no more than immoderate Hyperboles, or Pieces of Wit, which can have no other use but to lead us into Error. *Fourthly*, that this Opinion destroys the necessity and indeed the Benefit of Jesus Christ's Death: So that his Death is, according to

to this Hypothesis, no more (if we may be allowed to say so) than an Episode of a Romance. And, *Lastly*, that this Principle renders the Language of the Scripture, Obscure and Unintelligible; False and Fallacious, Absurd and Ridiculous, Impious and full of Blasphemy.

I dare affirm, that those who do but reflect upon these five kinds of Proofs which we shall propose in a succinct manner, will find it very difficult to preserve their Doubts upon the Subject; and that if they are still perswaded that our Doctrine has its Difficulties and Obscurities in this respect, they will also believe, that as high and as incomprehensible as it is in itself thro' the Sublimity and Grandure of its Objects, yet it has an Evidence of Revelation, and some certain hints which ought to oblige us to receive it.

I say, *First*, that Jesus Christ cannot be supposed to be a mere Man, or a mere Creature, without weakning infinitely all the Ideas we have of the Charity and Mercy of God. It is notorious, that the great Benefit of this Mercy consists in God's giving us his Beloved Son, and in delivering him up for us to Death. This is a gift that includes all others: For, according to the Apostle, *He that gave us his own Son, will also give us all things.* But if Jesus Christ is by Nature but a mere Creature, then the Gift of Jesus Christ is incomparably of less Value than the Salvation of Mankind; and we should be so far from being surpris'd that God has purchas'd our Salvation so dear, that we should wonder he purchas'd it so cheap: Which is abominable Blasphemy.

As Righteous and Holy as we conceive Jesus Christ to be, we ought to think that an infinite number of Persons who love God with all their Heart and with all their Strength, will in the day

day of their Triumph and Complete Regeneration, be a more agreeable Object in the sight of God than Jesus Christ. Therefore the Salvation of Mankind is more precious than the Life of Jesus Christ; and that so much the more, because Jesus Christ in losing his Life, does not lose his Holiness, which is quite of another Value from his Life.

Indeed we must not here compare *simply* Jesus Christ with the Belivers that are to Inherit his Kingdom; but we are to compare the Temporal Life which he has lost for 'em with that Eternal and Happy Life which they have acquir'd by him: And then we shall see, that the Gift of Jesus Christ a mere Creature, is of less Value than the Salvation of Mankind.

It is very conceivable, that if Jesus Christ is not a mere Man, but God-Man, this Alliance which he hath with the Deity, renders both his Life and Blood infinitely precious. There is no manner of Difficulty to persuade our selves of it, by reasoning from the Greater to the Less. A Lump of Clay is of no Value or Dignity; we don't matter how many blows are given it: 'Tis indifferent to us whether it be destroyed or annihilated. Yet do but enliven this Earth, and unite it to a Spirit, and this Union will presently produce a kind of Nobleness and Dignity in this Body, as will add Honour to its Actions, and Value to what it does or suffers for you. Then unite this matter already animated to the Divine Essence, and it will contract an infinite Dignity, for this very reason that 'tis so particularly united to God; and its sufficiency may make an Equivalent to pains Everlasting. For, if the sufferings of a Person of Quality are of more Value, than the sufferings of a Peasant; if those of a Kings Son, than those of a Person

Person of Quality; and if those of a King himself, than those of his own Son: It follows that if in this Gradation we may go in *infinitum* and may find a Person of such Dignity as hath no Bounds, his Sufferings will be also of an infinite Value. Therefore Jesus Christ being God manifested in the Flesh, and possessing the Glory of the Deity in the midst of Infirmities and Miseries incident to a Nature like our own could suffer but one Death of an infinite Value; and God who gives him us to suffer for us, makes us a Present without Limit, or Bound.

But after all, a Man's but a Man, and 'twould be to exalt the Mercy of God after a Childish manner, to Cry out, O! Unspeakable Love! O! Unbounded Mercy, which giveth the Temporal Life of a mere Man, or a mere Creature for the Eternal Salvation of Mankind! We must therefore search for another Mystery in these words of the holy Spirit: *Herein is manifested the Love of God towards us, in that he hath sent his only Son into the World, that we might live through him.*

If this Supposition of our Adversaries renders incomprehensible all that the Scripture tells us of that grand Effort of God's Love in delivering Jesus Christ unto Death for us, it no less renders incomprehensible all that we are told concerning the Love of Jesus Christ. For, if he suffers in our sense, he suffers at least some moments the weight of the Divine Curse, he struggles with the Justice of God which looks upon him with severity; and he feels the Desertion of his Father with a Grief proportion'd to the Ardency of his Love. Thus is his Love as great, as the Terrors of God's Justice, which drawing themselves up in Battalia against him

at this very time, are exceeding terrible. But if Jesus Christ suffers only in the sense of our Adversaries; if he suffers with all the Sentiments of his Father's Love; if he dyes, as Martyrs commonly do, so fully perswaded of his own Innocence; if he feels not himself loaded with the Sins of Mankind, it may be said, that this Action of his has nothing very *Heroical* in it. Thus *Codrus* King of the *Athenians* would at least be as praise-worthy as Jesus Christ. For that Prince putting himself at the head of his Army against the Enemy, and being perswaded upon the Answer of some Oracle or other, which was well or ill explain'd, that if he was not killed himself in the Battle, his Subjects could never gain the Victory, he threw aside his Royal Habit, put on ragged Cloaths, and coming into the Enemies Camp, frustrated the Design they had to save him, by provoking a Soldier, who slew him. Certainly *Codrus* does more for his Subjects than Jesus Christ did for Beleivers. For, he loses a Life after which he expected no other, with design to free his Subjects from Oppression; whereas Jesus Christ parts with his Temporal Life, because he is sure to live and reign Eternally with his Subjects, whom he redeems by Sacrificing himself for them.

In short, we should have more reason in this Case to admire the Love of God towards Jesus Christ than towards us. For God to save Mankind, is what makes us sensible of God's Mercy in the remission of our Sins: But, for God to recompence Jesus Christ for his having suffer'd Death, by raising him up gloriously, making him the Monarch of the World, the Head of Angels, the Judge of Man, and the King of Ages; by putting into his Hands the Gifts of his Spirit, Life and Death; by giving him

him his Name, Glory, Power, and the Disposall of his Eternal Happinels: This is such a Kindness for Jesus Christ as is Unparallel; and Jesus Christ ought not to grudge the Blood he has shed to arrive at this state of Glory. There was nothing he could have done better for himself. And now, to understand the Language of the Holy Spirit, we must make another Gospel: And instead of saying, *God so loved the World that he has given his Son to it, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life*, we must say, *God so loved Jesus Christ, that after he had honour'd him with the Title of his Son, he put the World in Subjection under him, and gave him all those who should believe in him*. Instead of saying, *He that spared not his own Son, shall he not with him give us all Things?* We must say, *It is no wonder that He who promises to give us Eternal Life, has also given us the Life of Jesus Christ*.

When St. Paul says, that God has given us his Son, he means, that he has given us the Life of his Son; and reasoning from the greater to the less, he concludes, that God will also give us all other Things, because he supposes that the Life of Jesus Christ is more precious than all good Things. But is there any manner of Proportion between the Temporal Life of one Only Creature, (though never so Holy) and between the Eternal and Happy Life of all the Saints? And can any thing be falser than the Apostles Reasoning, if the Principle we oppose were any thing to the Purpose?

Some perhaps will here say, that the Love of God is manifested, in that he giveth us Eternal Life with his Son. But 'tis easie to discover the Deceit which lyes under these Words. For, God does two Things. He gives us Eternal Life.

Life ; and he gives it us by the Ministry of his Son. We cannot consider the *First*, without admiring his Goodness and Mercy. This is granted. But then it may be ask'd, how the *Second* shews us the *Love* of God ? For, to us it appears to be no great Effort of Mercy, to give the Temporal Life of One Man, for the Eternal Life of all Men. Thus, Two things may be consider'd in the Deliverance of the *Israelites*. God redeems the People of *Israel* from the Captivity wherein they groan'd, after he had saved their First-born from the Sword of the Destroying Angel : and He commands the *Israelites* to kill a Lamb, and to take of the Blood, and sprinkle the Door-posts of their Houses with it. I grant, that the Goodness and Mercy of God is to be admired, if we consider the *Benefit*. For the *Israelites* were reduced to a very sad Extremity : There Deliverance came very seasonably : And they had desired it very Impatiently. But, we should think our selves perfectly abused, if any one endeavour'd to perswade us that the Goodness and Mercy of God shin'd in a particular manner, because 'twas the Blood of a Lamb, that was the Token to the Destroying Angel, to spare the First-born of the *Israelites* ; or because 'twas by the Sacrifice of the Passover, that God did in some measure design to work such a Redemption. A man would be look't upon as little less than a Madman, who should say, Behold how great is the Love of God, to put a Lamb, or many Lambs to Death for the Preservation of his People. No doubt 'twill be Answer'd, that the Life of Jesus Christ, as mere Man, is incomparably more precious than the Life of a Sacrifice under the Law. I grant it : But then, as the Life of a Lamb had no manner of Resemblance with the Temporal Deliverance of the *Israelites* ; so

likewise we may say, that the Temporal Life of Jesus Christ bears no manner of resemblance or proportion with the Eternal Life of Mankind, if it be true that Jesus Christ is no more than a mere Man, or even a mere Creature. Nay, I don't know but it might be said, that the Life of a Lamb bears a greater resemblance with the Life of a Man, than the Temporal Life of Jesus Christ, consider'd as mere Man, does with the Eternal Salvation of Mankind. For, in short, the Life of a Lamb is Temporal; and the Life of an *Israelite* which was redeem'd by a Lamb, was also Temporal: and 'tis well known that there is some kind of proportion between Temporal and Temporal. But the Life of Jesus Christ as mere Man, or even a mere Creature, is Temporal; and the Life which he has purchas'd for Mankind is Eternal: and we know that there is no manner of Proportion between a Temporal Life which is Finite, and an Eternal Life which is Infinite. But after all, let us not take things in this rigour, seeing also 'tis needless. It is sufficient that it appears to us very evidently by this Example, that the Mercy and Goodness of God may be sometimes admired in the Benefit he bestows on us, without being obliged to own it in the way God is pleas'd to chuse to purchase it for us. And this is enough to oblige us to say, that indeed God does recommend his Love towards us, in that when we were his Enemies he was reconcil'd to us, and was pleas'd to bind himself to give us Eternal Life: but that his Mercy is ne're the more conspicuous in this, because he has given the Temporal Life of one Man to purchase Eternal Life for all Mankind.

Jesus Christ, you will say, is the *Master*, and we are the *Servants*: and 'tis an extraordinary Act of Love for the Master to give himself

to Death. on purpose to ransom Slaves, and such Slaves too as were his Enemies. But there is something equivocal and obscure in this second Objection, which he must endeavour to clear. For, we must here distinguish the Love of the Father from the Love of the Son, and consider them separately and by themselves. The Father does not give himself, but he gives Jesus Christ, by consenting to his suffering Death for our sakes. Jesus Christ cannot be call'd *Master* with respect to God. In this respect he is as much a *Servant* as we are, since he's God's own Creature, and subject to his Laws. Thus, God does not give a *Master*, but he delivers his own *Servant*. I confess 'tis one of the most perfect of *Servants*; but 'tis still a *Servant*. 'Tis plain, God shews his Love by being willing to save his Enemies; his Mercy appears in his Design: But it does not appear that his Mercy is at all conspicuous in this Gift of his *Servant*, who loses nothing of his Essential Holiness, Glory and Happiness; who loses but three days of Life, a loss which is worth the Empire of the Universe to him; and who by consequence Sacrifices no great matter on his side. For if this Person, be but a mere Man, or even but a mere Creature; and in suffering Death he have nothing else to fear but Death it self; and by his sufferings he obtain an Eternity of Life and Happiness for those he redeems; and if, lastly, he is to be Highly Exalted after his Debasement: Where is this mighty Effort of his Love? Those who have devoted themselves to Death for the Preservation of their Country, in the certainty of dying and the uncertainty of living after Death, obtaining for a recompence of the Sacrifice they sell, but an imaginary Glory, which could not F'atter their Ashes, and a vain

and distant Immortality which abated nothing of the Horrors of their Death, did in this case make a greater Attempt upon themselves than did Jesus Christ. I shall add further: were we to choose amongst all the Men of the World, even amongst the most Barbarous and Unnatural, we should scarce be able to find One who was not ready to suffer Death upon the like Conditions. Where is the Man, who if he could, would not be glad to purchase Eternal Life for all Mankind by suffering Death, if he were sure to rise again the Third Day, and to enjoy thereby an Absolute Empire over all the Creatures? though he did it not out of Charity, he would certainly do it out of Interest and self Love. It must be therefore granted that Jesus Christ is not a mere Man, and that he has not suffer'd a Death like to that of other Men: But it must be said, that this Divine Saviour being Highly Exalted above us by the Dignity of his Person, has suffered a Death accompanied with a sense of God's Justice, and of those unspeakable Terrours and avenging Horrors, by which God punishes the Crime either in him that commits it, or in him to whom 'tis imputed.

It will be said, *Thirdly*, that the Love of God consists in his having given us not a mere Man, but a Man that is his own Son. But we would fain know, whether this Man be the Son of God in a Proper and Literal, or in a Figurative and Metaphorical Sense. If he is the Son of God in a Proper and Literal Sense, it must be by Eternal Generation; which is exactly what we ask. If he be the Son of God in a Figurative Sense, we desire to know, whether it be a great Effort of Love, to give a Man that is not the Son of God but by a Figure and a Metaphor.

taphor, for the Salvation of Mankind. Let us suppose a Prince were indispensably oblig'd to destroy a good Number of his Subjects to obey some inviolable Law, except some Person were to be found that was worthy of their Surety, and of ransoming 'em by his Death; and that this Prince being mov'd with Compassion in this sad Extremity, should declare that he would give his Son's Life to redeem them: you cannot, doubtless, but conceive a very high Idea of his Mercy and Love. But if some time after you should hear, that this King gives not his own only Son, and also that he has no true Son of his own; but that all the Mystery of this great Love, about which there was so much stir, comes only to this, namely, that he made choice of one of his Subjects, whom he adopted from a State of Indigence and extreme Poverty, to give him the Education of the Son of a Prince; and that afterwards he has a mind to deliver him up to Death as a Ransom for his perishing Subjects, except the Honour of his Laws be otherwise preserv'd, and then, when he has suffer'd Death, to make him the Heir of his Crown: you would find that the Clemency of this Prince is certainly very worthy our Admiration and Acknowledgement, in that he pardons those who had offended him; but 'twere a childish Hyperbole for a Man to cry out upon this Prince's giving his Son, that the King so loved his Kingdom, that he gave his Son, his only Son, to preserve the Life of his Offending Subjects, who could not be ransom'd but by so great a Price.

But for the better Understanding it, we need only suppose, what our Adversaries don't at all gainsay, which is, that the Sacrifice of *Isaac* is an Excellent Type of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Isaac, who was the Delight of his Father, and his only Son, was bound, in order to be Sacrificed by *Abraham* himself, notwithstanding the murmuring of the Blood, and the secret Voice of Nature which spake on his Behalf; and so became an Excellent Type of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who was the Delight and Pleasure of the Everlasting Father, whom yet God delivers up to Death, and suffers Sorrows to take hold of, and inexpressible Terrors to encompass, notwithstanding his Tender Affection for him. The Types which represent the Death of *Jesus Christ*, do all agree in this general Relation: namely, in representing to us *Jesus Christ* as substituted in our place, like as the Sacrifices under the Law were substituted in the place of Sinners. But yet every Type has his particular Relation, by which 'tis distinguish'd from others. Thus the *Paschal Lamb* represents *Jesus Christ* in this, that as the Blood of the Lamb sprinkling the Doors of the *Israelites*, did secure 'em from the Hand of the destroying Angel: So the Blood of *Jesus Christ* sprinkling our Hearts, and flowing mystically in our Souls, secures us from the dreadful Effects of the avenging Justice of God. But the Sacrifice of *Isaac* being a Bloodless Sacrifice, it cannot have this resemblance with *Jesus Christ*. We must therefore look for another: which consists in this, that as *Abraham* offer'd up his only Son, so God delivered up to Death his own Son. Suppose then 'twere now told you, that *Abraham* did not offer up his only Son, nor his own Son, but took the Son of *Eleazar*, gave him the Name of *Isaac*, and, if you will, put on him the Cloaths of his Son, in this case you wou'd forbear wondring at the Obedience

ence and Faith of *Abraham*, in making no scruple to Sacrifice his own, only Son.

We look purely for the Image in a Type, and for the Reallity and Truth in the Accomplishment : But if we are to believe our Adversaries, we are henceforward to invest this order, and to look for the Reallity and Truth in the Type, and the Image and Appearances in the Accomplishment. Therefore *Abraham* made some great Attempt, for he offer'd up his Son in effect, and not only in Appearance : but God does nothing in delivering Jesus Christ unto Death; he seems to give his Son, when 'tis only his Servant, whom he calls by the Name of his Son only out of Design to deliver him to Death : So that this Expression, *He spared not his own Son*, becomes hereby equally Vain and Illusorious.

But to advance the Dignity of Jesus Christ, some will say, that this Man whom God giveth, is made the Heir of Eternal Life : Which will do them no service. For, as Jesus Christ obtains not this Sovereign Empire but in consequence of his Sufferings and Humiliation, it may well be said, that God Crowns his Servant to reward his Patience : but it still abides a Truth, that God has given none but his Servant for the Redemption of Mankind ; a Servant who was bound to fulfil God's Law for himself, being *then* but an Unprofitable Servant ; and a Servant who has done but a very small Act of Charity towards his Brethren ; there being not a Man in the World, who would not have done what he has done for us with all his Heart, if he might have had the same Glory. Thus let them turn things which way they please, they cannot destroy the Divinity of Jesus Christ, without altering Religion, destroying the true Sence of the Types, and so weakening the
Idea

Idea of God's Great and Signal Gift in the Gift of his Son, that all the Expressions of Scripture do after this appear to us to be but idle Orations or mere flights of Fancy.

Neither is there any Confusion comparable to the Confusion of our Adversaries, when they find themselves oblig'd to give us an Explication of this grand Effort of our Heavenly Father's Love, which makes the particular Character of the Covenant of Grace. *He was before, say they, the Father of just Men: but he did not appear to be so. Which is the Reason why he is seldom call'd by the Name of Father in the Old Testament; neither is he so called because he designs to give us Eternal Life, but because he created us and bestows on us Temporal Goods.* The Socinians make the great Love of God to consist in his giving us Eternal Life. And they are in the right on't: for they speak conformably to the Principles. But the Holy Writers of the New Testament make it likewise to consist in God's having given us his Son. *God so loved the World, that he gave, &c.* and this makes an inexplicable Difficulty in their Principles. For we understand 'em well enough, when they prove to us God's Love by his giving us *Eternal Life*: But we don't see how they can prove it by his giving us his Son.

God, say they, in giving his only Son for a Sacrifice for our Sins, engages himself to us thereby by a Pledge of an inestimable Value, and promises us not only to forgive us our Transgressions, and to absolve us, but also to give us *Eternal Life*. And by this great Love which he shows us, and that when we were his Enemies, he draws us effectually to and reconciles us with himself. And also when he will not forgive us our Sins but by means of his Son, who surrenders himself to be the Sacrifice

offer'd for them, he engages us thereby to his Son, and subjects us to him; and he does at the same time declare how much he abhors those Sins which must be expiated by his Son's Blood, and what aversion we ought to have for 'em for the time to come. This Discourse is ingenious, and does very well conceal the weakness of the Cause which it endeavours to Disguise. For being not able to prove to us the Love of God, the way which the Apostles take to exalt it so much, namely, by the Gift of his Son, they cunningly collect all the Circumstances and Considerations, which may best discover this Love to us, as the Remission of our Sins, Eternal Life, our being Enemies to God, at a time when he form'd the Design of saving us, and the Motives of Sanctification and hatred of Sin, which we find in the way God is pleased to forgive us our Transgression. But all these Considerations are Foreign, and do not clear the Difficulty before us. Our business is to know, whether the Mercy of God gives us a very considerable Gift in giving the Life of a mere Man for our Salvation. This is what must be now examin'd, and upon which our Adversaries will be never able to satisfy themselves, nor to satisfy others. God, say they, in giving us his Son, obliges himself by a Pledge of an inestimable Value to give us Eternal Life. Can it be said of a mere Man, how Holy soever he be, that he is a Pledge of an inestimable Value; and especially, that the Gift of his Temporal Life, which he lays down but to take it up again in three Days after, is a sufficient Security to assure us of Eternal Life prepar'd for Mankind? Is it to be conceived, that the End of Jesus Christ's Death was to serve for a Pledge to Men; as if God had made Moses to dye on purpose that his Death might

might serve for a Pledge to the Children of Israel, that God would not only bring them out of Egypt, but that he would also lead them into the Land of Canaan? Can Men conclude, that because God has given them the Life of a mere Man, he will also give them Eternal Life; seeing first God gives 'em the Life of this Man without any necessity, and besides, the Temporal Life of a mere Man, is very inconsiderable if compar'd with the Eternal Life of Man-kind?

By this great Love which he shews us, even when we were his Enemies, &c. he draws us to himself, &c. And where is this great Love? Is then the Life of a mere Man so precious; and especially of one that does but exchange a Life full of Misery and Sufferings, for a Blessed and Eternal Life, which he obtains both for himself and his Disciples.

And also when he will not forgive us our Sins but by means of his Son, who is the Sacrifice offer'd for them, he engages and subjects us to him, &c. This does very near discover to us what our Adversaries are asham'd to own, and yet must be forc'd to acknowledge, if they will reason consequentially from their Principles: viz. that in the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ God does more for Jesus Christ, than Jesus Christ does for us; and thus we must no longer say, *God so loved the World, that he gave his Son*, but *God so loved his Son that he gave him the World*. In effect, the Death of Jesus Christ does not give us to God, seeing we are already the Objects of his Love, and God was appeased towards us, before his Son dy'd in our Stead. It is not true, say our Adversaries, that God being provok'd against Mankind, was appeased by Jesus Christ, seeing quite the contrary may be said, viz. that God being

being appeased towards Mankind, appeases and reconciles to himself by Jesus Christ Men who were provoked against him, &c. Jesus Christ does not reconcile us to God, he does not make our Peace with him. It seems then that we might have been well enough without him; and also, that if God had thought good, we could have obtained Eternal Life without his Mediation. For, as to the rest, God needed only to work upon our Hearts by his Grace, in order to Triumph over that hardness which made us his Enemies. But Jesus Christ being but a mere Man, as is pretended, could not naturally aspire to a supernatural Glory and Power, if he had not signaliz'd his Obedience by his Death. Thus is the Fruit which we reap from his Death very small, and the Benefit which Jesus Christ reaps from it himself very considerable, seeing hereby he finds himself of a sudden become the Head of Men and Angels, and the Possessor of Heaven and Eternity.

And he does at the same time declare how much he abhors those Sins which must be expiated by his Son's Blood, &c. Indeed, if Jesus Christ is but a mere Man, as our Aversaries suppose, it will be very hard for us to be mov'd with this consideration, and we shall much rather say, that there is no Reason for us to make any great scruple of committing such Sins as can be so easily blotted out, seeing the Blood of one Man is sufficient to expiate for the Sins of all Mankind.

C H A P. II.

Wherein it is shewed that the Doctrine of our Adversaries destroys the Idea which the Scripture gives us of the Greatness of our Mysteries, and the Nature of True Faith.

IF the Principle of our Adversaries weakens infinitely the Ideas of the Love and Mercy of God, we may say it overthrows on one hand the Truth of our Mysteries, and on the other the Nature of True Faith.

In Effect, if Jesus Christ is but a mere Creature, who can comprehend the Apostle's thought, when he says, *Now without Controversy great is the Mystery of Godliness, God manifested in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, believed on in the World, preach'd to Gentiles, and raised up into Glory?*

It cannot be denied, but that the Mystery of the Incarnation (such as we profess to believe it,) is Great, Sublime and infinitely above the Capacity of our Understandings; whether you consider the ineffable Union of the Humane Nature with the Divine Nature which is so surprising to Man, and Unconceivable to Angels; or whether you respect the Wonder of Love which our Faith discovers therein; or lastly, whether you have respect to the important consequences of such an Union. But we don't see how the Birth of a mere Man who is born in Flesh, because he could not be born otherwise, how acceptable soever he is supposed to be to God, and how righteous and holy soever he is in Effect, can be reckon'd for a great Mystery.

To

To speak exactly, and to reason justly upon the Hypothesis of our Adversaries, we should rather look for Mysteries in the Terms of Scripture, than in the Objects of Religion: And we should not say, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness*, but *Great is the Mystery of the Language of the Evangelists and the Apostles*.

We would here willingly appeal to the Consciences of those against whom we Dispute: And freely ask them, whether they would be ever minded to make the great Mystery of Godliness to consist in this Article, *God manifested in the Flesh*.

Certainly those who are obliged to have recourse to so violent Explications of Scripture, by affixing to the Terms a sense never before heard of, and by supposing *Apostrophes* and *Parentheses* where there are none, don't care to express themselves after so troublesome a manner, which they lay open to insuperable Difficulties.

Now all the Difficulties that are found in our Divinity lye in the Objects: whereas the principal Difficulties that are found in the Divinity of our *Adversaries* lye in the *Terms of Scripture*. But as the Holy Scripture is unquestionably a Book that's plain and easy to be understood, it's Language ought not to be the source of our Difficulties: and as the Objects of the Gospel are Sublime and Incomprehensible according to the Character of Preaching which is Foolishness in appearance, they may and ought to make that holy obscurity which we find in that Divine Book.

But let us consider this Passage a little nearer, and make some Reflexions upon it. First then, we are to observe, that by that Doctrine or Mystery of Godliness must be evidently understood

derstood the Doctrine or Myſtery of the Goſpel. For, 'tis the Cuſtom of the holy Spirit to ſpeak thus. *All they, ſaith the Apoſtle, that will live Godly muſt ſuffer Perſecution.* Beſides, we need only conſider this Enumeration, *God manifeſted in the Fleſh, juſtify'd in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, believed on in the World, preached to the Gentiles, and raiſed up into Glory,* and we ſhall ſee that it contains in order the Objects which made the Subſtance of the Apoſtles preaching.

This being thus ſuppoſed, I firſt demand of thoſe that believe Jeſus Chriſt to be a mere Man, what can be the meaning of thoſe words, *God manifeſted in the Fleſh*? If it be this; that the Man Jeſus Chriſt converſed among Men, certainly the Myſtery is but little. It is ſurprizing that *Enoch* walked with God; that *Elijah* was tranſlated into Heaven; and that Jeſus Chriſt was raiſed up into Glory, becauſe that Heaven is not naturally a Place for Bodies: but, that a mere Man was ſeen upon Earth, and converſed among other Men, this was never wondred at by any. Beſides, what Man is ſo blind that he don't ſee that this Expreſſion, *God Manifeſted in the Fleſh*, evidently includes an oppoſition between God whom we cannot ſee, and a Body which we can ſee; between a God that's *Spiritual*, and Fleſh that is *Senſible*? And what will become of the Force of this oppoſition, or of the truth of this Myſtery, if 'tis not the *True God*, who was manifeſted in the Fleſh?

Jeſus Chriſt, you will ſay, though he be a mere Man by Nature, yet is God, becauſe he represents God, and is in his place. But how does this juſtify the Expreſſion before us? Kings are the Gods of the Earth, becauſe they represent God, and are in his ſtead: and yet what Man is ſo mad as to ſay, *Now without Contro-*

versie Great is the Mystery of Royalty, *God manifested in the Flesh.*

Our Adversaries are not sensible they make a ridiculous Match of real Flesh, and a true Manifestation with a God that's Metaphorical, and improperly so call'd; whereas they should join a God properly so call'd to real Flesh, and a true Manifestation.

In effect 'tis certain, that that which makes here (I will not say) the *Greatness* of the Mystery, but simply the *Truth* of it, is the Opposition that is between that which is signified by the Term *God*, and that which is exprest by the Term *Flesh*. Now there is some opposition between *Flesh*, and a God properly so called, as is the Supreme God: but there is none at all between a Metaphorical God, and real *Flesh*, seeing 'tis in no wise surprising that a Man compounded of *Flesh* is in God's stead, and is called God, because he represents him. Wherein then do they make the Greatness of this Mystery to consist, *God manifested in the Flesh*?

It consists, perhaps some will say, in this, that the Glory of the Divine Power with which Jesus Christ was invested when he conversed upon Earth, did appear in such shining Miracles, and in so great a Number during his Conversation upon Earth, that it seemed as if God himself was come down to inhabit *Flesh*.

If this be so, then the Mystery of the Gospel has nothing in it more surprising than the Mystery of the Law; and we may find in *Moses*, as well as in Jesus Christ, a *God manifested in the Flesh*. For who does not know that *Moses* appeared invested with a power, which acted in all the Parts of Nature; and that with the Rod of God, which he held in his Hand, he turned the Rivers into Blood, darkned the Air, suspended

spended the Sea, clove the Rocks, opened the Earth, fired the Clouds, made the Mountains to shine, and acted with the same Force and Empire as if he had been the Lord of Nature, and Sovereign of the Universe?

But to say nothing of *Moses*, have not the Apostles themselves wrought Miracles? They have, and even Greater than Jesus Christ did, according to the Promise made them by this Divine Saviour. So that the Glory of the Divine Power was manifested even in the Apostles. And yet where do you read it said of an Apostle, *God manifested in the Flesh*? Further, either the Miracles of Jesus Christ shew'd that the Divine Power resided in Jesus Christ as in its Original, and that he did All by his own Verture; and so they must necessarily acknowledge with us, that he is True *God* as well as True *Man*: Or else they purely signified that God wrought these Miracles by the Ministry of Jesus Christ, in his Presence, and at his Request: And then 'tis evident, that the same may be said of the Apostles, and we may cry out upon their account as well as upon Jesus Christ's Account, Great is the Mystery of Godliness, *God manifested in the Flesh*.

But wherein, I pray, should consist the Greatness of this Mystery? Is it then so astonishing that God's Power displays it self with Lustre at the request of a Holy Man, and upon Occasions of great importance to his own Glory? And could it be said, when *Elias* made Fire to descend from Heaven to confound the impiety of the Worshippers of *Baal*, that *God was manifested in the Flesh*? certainly it must be granted, that to fulfil this singular, extraordinary and unknown expression till the Gospel, there must be also a singular, new, extraordinary and unknown

known Mystery under the Law. For as Language is proportion'd to the Objects it represents, the Singularity of Language does excellently demonstrate the Singularity of the Object. Now the Language of the Law will appear new and extraordinary to those who lived under the Oeconomy of Nature: As will the Language of the Gospel to those who lived only under the Covenant of the Law. But why so? 'Tis because the Objects of the Law are very different from the Objects of Nature, and the Objects of the Gospel very different from the Objects of the Law. What then can we judge of this new, surprizing and extraordinary (if there was ever any such) Expression, *God manifested in the Flesh*, if it does not signifie an unknown Object in Nature and under the Law?

In short, as subtle soever as our Adversaries are, and which way soever they offer violence to their understanding, that they may fasten their Prejudices upon Passages of Scripture, I don't see how they can give any reasonable explication of this Passage. It seems to me that their Language is, instead of being proper, altogether contradictory to the Language of the Apostle. For, according to them, 'tis the *Flesh* that is manifested to be God; (now we know that by *Flesh* Scripture understands the Humane Nature) and according to the Apostle 'tis *God* who is manifested, or who appears in *Flesh*. According to *Socinus*, that which is first and by Nature *Flesh*, is exalted by Grace to be called God, because he represents God in a wonderful manner. There is then, first, *Flesh*, and, secondly, the *Manifestation* or Representation of *God*: But, according to the Apostle, that which *was* God is manifested, shews it self, or appears in *Flesh*. Here then there is first a *God*,

and afterwards a *Manifestation* of this God in visible *Flesh*. And this is unquestionably the first and most natural impression of those words, *God manifested in the Flesh*.

When the Prophet gives the great Title of *Immanuel* or *God with us* to Jesus Christ, we presently imagine a certain Eminence of Divine Perfection in Jesus Christ, which cannot belong to a mere Man. For this Title was never given to any Prophet; and indeed it appears too high for the greatest Prophet. And yet our conjecture would not, perhaps, be strong enough, if the Scripture gave only this Title to Jesus Christ. But when we see that he is besides called *God manifested in the Flesh*, this last Title does make us admirably well understand the first, and the first serves also to shew us that 'tis not without Reason and Mystery that the last was given to our Lord Jesus Christ. For, in short, as the first of these two Titles naturally signifies that we were separated and at a distance from God, but are now brought nigh to him in Jesus Christ, *who is God with us*; so we are given to understand by the second, that the *Flesh* was, or did appear, incompatible with God's Presence, and that nevertheless God manifested himself in this *Flesh*. As then to fulfil the truth of the first of these Titles, the True God must be really with us. So to fulfil the truth of the second, the True God must be really manifested in the *Flesh*. And this Conjecture does not appear unreasonable. But we will add a more convincing Consideration, by comparing our Exposition with the Exposition of our Adversaries.

Jesus Christ, according to us, being God and Man, because he was not only before his own Birth, but also before *Abraham's Birth*, because he was with God, and because he

was God, was *manifested in the Flesh*, having assum'd our Bodily Nature; was *justify'd in the Spirit*, having sent his holy Spirit to justify both the Efficacy of his Death, and the Truth of his Resurrection; was *preached to the Gentiles*, *seen of Angels* in his Agony and Triumph, *believed on by Men*, and raised up in great Glory, born upon a Cloud, and in the sight of his Disciples. What Difficulty is there in all this? This is the Gospel which we have received from the Beginning. Jesus Christ, according to the *Socinians*, is by Nature a mere Man, but was highly exalted for his Obedience to God even unto Death. Now in a Man that is merely a Man, I find but Three Things, a Body, a Soul, and the Compound resulting from the Union of both. I would fain know which of these Three was manifested in the Flesh. It cannot be the *Soul* of Jesus Christ; for 'twould be extravagant to call the Soul of Jesus Christ God, and to say that the Soul is manifested in the Flesh, and justified in the Spirit. Besides that we are speaking of a subject that was raised up into Glory. which is said no more of the Soul than 'tis of the Body. Neither is it the *Body* of Jesus Christ that was manifested in the Flesh: For Flesh is not manifested in Flesh. Nor can it be said, Lastly, that 'tis the whole Compound, or the Entire Man that was manifested in the Flesh: For this compound or Entire Man is but the Body and Soul join'd together. Now it cannot be said that the Body and Soul joined together were manifested in Flesh or in Body: for the expression would be absurd and extravagant.

If the Question here were about an Accident, or about many Accidents together, it might be said, that 'twas the Power of God, or his Holiness, or his Wisdom, or his Authority, or

many other Divine Qualities of that kind, which were manifested in the Flesh. But the Question is about a Subject which is a Person, seeing it can be said of no other that it was raised up in Glory. This Person therefore is either Humane or Divine. It cannot be a Divine Person, for, according to our Adversaries, there is none other but the Father. It must then be a Humane Person. But a Humane Person is a Man: Therefore a Man was manifested in the Flesh. If it be a Man, 'tis a Body and a Soul joined together: For a Man or a Humane Person is no more, by the confession of those against whom we dispute. Therefore I ask once more, whether it can be said, whether 'twas ever said, without the greatest Impertinence, that a Body and a Soul joined together are manifested in Flesh? In fine, it cannot be denied, but if Jesus Christ is a mere Man, the same Nature which was raised up into Glory, was manifested in the Flesh. This must needs follow, seeing Jesus Christ has not two Natures, according to our Adversaries. Therefore the *Humane Nature* of Jesus Christ must have been manifested in the Flesh, as it was raised up into Glory. But was it ever said, that a Humane Nature was manifested in Flesh?

It cannot only be said, that the Mystery of God's Manifestation in the Flesh is overthrown by the Doctrine of our Adversaries: but it may also be added, that this Doctrine destroys all the Mysteries at once, by removing absolutely whatsoever is difficult in Religion.

The Cross of Jesus Christ is an Object that's Difficult, Sublime, Incomprehensible; and it must needs be opposite to our Prejudices, seeing the Apostle of the Gentiles calls it, *The Scandal of the Jews, and the Foolishness of the Greek*

Greek. And yet, what is there mysterious and incomprehensible in the Cross of Jesus Christ, if Jesus Christ is a mere Man? Did the Jews never see Men acceptable to God, persecuted by the Wicked? Did the Servants of God never suffer Death, to signalize their Zeal towards him, or to confirm the Truth they declar'd? Either the Mystery consists in this, that 'tis a righteous Man that suffers, or that 'tis a Prophet, or that 'tis the Son of God, or that 'tis God. It cannot be, that 'tis a *righteous* Man: for neither the Jews nor the Gentiles can look upon the Death of an Innocent Man, overwhelm'd and oppress'd by guilty Creatures, as a very new Thing. It cannot be, that 'tis a *Prophet* that suffers Death. Many Prophets had been already seen to dye for the Truth. It cannot be, that 'tis the *Son of God*. For, if we are to believe our Adversaries, he is God's Son only by a Metaphor; or at least as *Adam* was in his State of Innocence, having been form'd immediately by the Power of God, and enrich'd with his Gifts and Graces. And lastly, it cannot be that 'tis God who dies, seeing our Adversaries ridicule this Expression, and pretend that 'tis Figurative or Extravagant.

St. *Paul* informs us, that since in the Wisdom of God Men have not known him by Wisdom, the good Pleasure of the Father was to save them by the Foolishness of Preaching. The Gospel is evidently call'd Foolishness for no other reason but because it contains such things as appear incredible and incomprehensible to us. Now pray what is there in the Gospel that appears to us either incomprehensible or incredible, if we follow the Books of our Adversaries? Their Religion is very sure-

footed, when they remove, or rather pretend to remove, all the Difficulties out of the way.

Certain it is, that there is more difficulty and obscurity in the Objects revealed to us in the Gospel, than in those presented to us by the Revelation of Nature. And yet if the Hypothesis of our Adversaries were true, there would be more Mysteries in the Foot of a *Hand-Worm* than in all the Christian Religion.

The Objects of the Gospel are incomparably more Sublime and Incomprehensible than the Objects of the Law. The reason is very plain; because the Objects of the Law do not bear the Name of Mysteries as do those of the Gospel: for under the Law Men were not to captivate their Understanding as under the Gospel: In fine, the Objects of the Law were never said to be Foolishness, considering them as being contrary to our Prejudices. And yet, if the Sentiment of our Adversaries were true, there would be unquestionably greater Mysteries under the Law than under the Gospel. God, for instance, appearing in the Bush in *Horeb*, would be a greater Mystery, than God manifested in the Flesh.

I shall add further; that this Doctrine destroys true Faith: whose Nature and Excellency consists in this, namely, in receiving such Truths as are difficult, and we would not receive otherwise, upon the Testimony of God who reveals them. Which plainly shews, that Faith and Sight must be different. *Sight* consists in our receiving such Truths as have a very natural Relation to our Notions and Light: but *Faith* consists in our receiving upon the Testimony of God, such Truths as are contrary to our Prejudices. Now this Distinction is utterly ruin'd, if Religion includes no other Truths than

what

what have as much agreeableness to our Understanding, as natural Truths can possibly have. But we shall have occasion to go over these Considerations in another place of this Work. In the mean time it will be very proper to justify what we proposed to shew in the third place in this Section, namely,

C H A P. III.

That the Sentiment of our Adversaries de-vests Jesus Christ of all his Honour, by making him to possess in a Metaphorical Sence those Titles which the Scripture gives him in a Proper Sense.

THE first Title that offers it self to our mind is the Title of *Son of God*: which the Scripture assigns to three different Subjects. For some possess it by a *Metaphor*. Thus *Job* calls God, *The Father of the Rain*. And the Stars seem also to bear this Name: as when 'tis said, that *the Morning Stars sung together, and all the Sons of God shouted for Joy*, *Job 38.* except you had rather understand the *Angels*. Others possess this glorious Title by *Adoption*, which the Scripture means, when it says, that God has adopted us in his Son; that he has given us this Privilege to be called the Sons of God; that we have received Adoption; that we are the Children of God, his Heirs, and joint Heirs with our Lord Jesus Christ. Lastly, this Title of *Son of God* is given to a Perfect and Divine Subject, which possesses it in a most particular and most eminent Sence: and this Subject is our Saviour
Jesus

Christ who is called in Scripture the only Son of God, God's own Son, the Son, *that* Son of God with the Article, the Son of his Love, his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased.

There is therefore a Son of God, that is God's own Son; who is more truly the Son of God, than those who are his Sons by Adoption; and there are Children which God adopts into his Love, who bear the Quality of the Sons of God with a juster Title, than those who are his Sons purely by a Figure and a Metaphor.

And yet the Sentiment of our Adversaries invests this order, which is according to the Analogy of Faith. Jesus Christ, according to their Principles, cannot be call'd the Son of God but by a Metaphor: and on the other hand, *we* are the Sons of God by Adoption, and that but in Jesus Christ. How can a Metaphorical Son be more truly a Son than Adopted Sons? And how do Adopted Sons owe their Adoption to a Metaphorical Son? For, in short, either Jesus Christ is himself adopted by the Father, or he is not. If he is adopted by the Father, how comes it that the Holy Spirit so often speaking of the Adoption of Believers, never speaks one Word to us of his? Why is this Expression unknown to Scripture, God hath adopted his Son Jesus Christ; and so unknown, that 'twould be lookt upon as Blasphemy? If God has adopted Jesus Christ, it follows that Jesus Christ is purely a Metaphorical Son. He is not so by *Nature*: our Adversaries cannot so much as indure the Expression. He is not so by *Adoption*: the Language of Scripture does not allow this Expression. Therefore he is only so by a *Metaphor*, and consequently, *we* are above Jesus Christ, having an Advantage which he has not.

Now that which confirms our Thought in this respect, is, that the Title of *Children of God*, which we bear, is look'd upon as one of the greatest Testimonies God has given us of his Love : it is the matter of the Believers Acknowledgment, who ought to thank him for that they are his Sons by his Grace. But the Title of Son which Jesus Christ bears, was never look'd upon as a *Proof* of God's Love, but rather as the Object of his Love. It cannot be said, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, because God loves him ; but we must say, that God loves him, because he is his Son. The Scripture will fairly say to us, *Behold what Love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God* : but will never say, Behold that Love God hath shew'd unto Jesus Christ, that he should call him his Son : because the Title of Sons which we bear, is foreign and accidental to us ; but the Title of Son which Jesus Christ bears, is Proper and Essential to him.

From hence it evidently follows, that the Four Foundations upon which our Adversaries Establish the Title of *Son of God* given to Jesus Christ, are not sufficient to support the Glory and Dignity of that Title. The First is his Miraculous Conception and Birth, the Second his Office, the Third his Resurrection, and the Fourth and Last his Sovereign Exaltation. For if Jesus Christ were not the Son of God in any other sense but because he was formed by the immediate Power of God in the Womb of the *Virgin Mary*, *Adam* would be as much the Son of God as Jesus Christ, he having likewise been formed by God's immediate Power : And notwithstanding the different manner of their Production, they both go out of the Creator's Hands, One

as immediately as the Other. If Jesus Christ is called the Son of God upon the account of his Ministry, it follows, that he was not the Son of God before his Ministry in so Eminent Sence as he was after it. And yet the very moment of his Investiture a Voice is heard saying *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*. Which shews, that he was the Son of God already. And as to the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus Christ, I confess, they served to declare solemnly that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. For, as the Apostle saith, *He was declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection from the dead*. But, if he was declared to be the Son of God, he was then the Son of God before he was declared. And indeed the Scripture points out to us this Title of the only Son of God by Two Characters: The First is, that Jesus Christ is in the Bosom of the Father: And the Second, that he is at the Right Hand of God. *No Man*, saith St. John, *hath seen God at any time. He that is in the Bosom of the Father, he hath declared him, or made him manifest, made him known. Therefore being*, saith St. Peter, *by the Right hand of God exalted, he hath shewed forth this, which ye now see and hear*. Of these two Characters, the most peculiar to the Son of God, is that of being in the Bosom of the Father. It is a mark of Honour to be seated at the Right-hand: but a mark of Affection to be rested on the Bosom. And as 'tis more Natural to love than to honour a Son; it follows, that to be in the Bosom of the Father, is a Character more peculiar to the Son of God, than that of sitting at his Right-hand. Now Jesus Christ was in the Bosom of the Father since his Conversation on Earth, and before his Exaltation. It follows therefore, that he was from

that

that time the Son of God in as Eminent a Sence,
or at least he had the greatest Characters.

The Gospel relates, that Jesus Christ being
gone up to *Jerusalem* at the Age of Twelve
Years, and being found sitting in the midst of
the Doctors, hearing them and asking them
Questions, and surprizing them by the wonderful
things he said to them, he answered those who
testified the concern they were in for him, *How*
is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be
about my Fathers Business?

We ask therefore, when Jesus Christ spake
these words, whether he was the only Son of
God, his own Son, and his Son by way of Emi-
nence? If he was not, why does he speak as
if he really were? Never did any of the Pro-
phets, being sent from God, say, I come from
my Father, or I must be about my Father's
Business. If he was, then it follows, that before
his Investiture, Resurrection and Exaltation, Jesus
Christ bore the Title of Son of God in that
Eminence which makes him to be God's own,
or only Son.

Jesus Christ being from that time the Son of
God by way of Excellence, either he was so in
respect of some Excellence which he *then* pos-
sessed, or in respect of the Glory which he *was*
to possess. If he was so only in respect of the
Glory which he *was* to possess, it follows, that
he was not the only Son of God at that time,
any otherwise than he was before his Birth; for,
before his Birth he was also appointed to this
Glory. It follows farther, that Jesus Christ dispu-
ting with the *Jewish* Doctors, was not the only
Son of God in any other sense, but as a Man
is a Believer, or a Child of God before his Vo-
cation, when he is purely Elected: For as Jesus
Christ was the only Son of God, because he was
appoint-

appointed to a Sovereign Glory ; 'twill follow that we are likewise the Adopted Sons of God even before our Vocation, because we are from all Eternity appointed to this Blessed Adoption.

It remains then, that Jesus Christ when he was disputing with the *Jewish* Doctors, bore the Title of *Only Son of God* from the Qualities he actually possessed by vertue of his present Condition. Now if this be so, Jesus Christ being but a mere Man, as our Adversaries pretend, could not be the Son of God, upon any other account but because he had been conceived by the Holy Ghost.

And yet it does not appear to us, that the Miraculous Conception of Jesus Christ can lay any Foundation for so Glorious a Title. For what is it to be conceived by the Holy Ghost ? 'Tis to be formed of a matter refin'd and sanctified by the immediate Power of God. But this gives Jesus Christ no manner of Advantage above *Adam*, who was created immediately by the Hands of God ; nor indeed above Glorified Saints, who are in some sence to be reproduced by the Power of their Creatour.

This Reflection will appear considerable, if we add another to it, which is much more important still : namely, that the Name of *Only Son of God*, of God's own Son, is a Name which does not only distinguish Jesus Christ from other Men, but does also exalt him infinitely above the Glorious Angels. For, he was made so much better than the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent Name than they. But if the Title of *Only Son of God* principally signifies, that he was form'd by the immediate Power of God in the Womb of the *Virgin Mary* : It cannot be conceived how this Title exalts him
above

above the Angels which preserved their Original purity. For, are not these Spirits likewise what they are, by the power of the Almighty, who not only formed them, but indued them with Holiness and Glory by taking them out of the Womb of Nothing? Where then is this Eminence of Perfection which makes this Title belong to Jesus Christ, and to no Other?

The Title of *Saviour*, which belongs so properly and truly to Jesus Christ, is also a Title that becomes incomprehensible, if Jesus Christ be but a mere Man, who did nothing else but preach the Gospel to Men, and suffer Death to give them an Example of Patience, and to ratifie the Covenant: in this Case he has done no more for us than what the Martyrs and Confessors did; namely, to instruct us both by their Doctrine and Example, and to confirm the Truth by their Death.

I will say farther, and boldly affirm, that according to this, *Moses* is more truly the Redeemer and Saviour of the *Israelites*, than Jesus Christ is the Redeemer and Saviour of Mankind. For, *Moses* does that by himself which Jesus Christ seems to do only by the Ministry of his Disciples. *Moses* shews the *Israelites* their Deliverance: And Jesus Christ makes us only hope for it. 'Tis true, *Moses* does not suffer Death as Jesus Christ does: but take notice, that the Death of Jesus Christ is as unprofitable to us, as the Death of *Moses* would have been to the *Israelites*. But as this last truth is of the number of those Capital truths, which are the Foundation of the Faith, we shall Establish it in a Chapter by itself.

C H A P. IV.

That, according to the Sentiment of our Adversaries, the Death of Jesus Christ be nothing of true Usefulness in it.

THose, who have study'd never so little the Doctrine of Salvation, cannot but know that the Death of Jesus Christ is not only Useful, but also highly Necessary. This is pretty well hinted to us by the Apostle *St. Paul*, when he says, that he determined to know nothing *But Jesus Christ, and him Crucified*: and is very well confirmed by the Testimony of the Prophets, of *John* the Baptist, and of Jesus Christ himself.

When the Prophets spoke in the clearest manner of Jesus Christ, they made it their principal Business to describe to us his Death and Sufferings: witness that famous Oracle in the LII. Chapter of the Prophecy of *Isaiah*, which contains so many illustrious Characters of the Messiah depending on his Death: And the Description given us of his Sufferings in the XXII. Psalm. *John* the Baptist seeing Jesus Christ, specifies him immediately by the Character of his Death. And he no sooner sees him, but he looks on him as a Sacrifice to be put to Death. *Behold* saith he, *The Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the World*. And Jesus Christ discoursing familiarly with his Disciples, constantly foretells the Afflictions he is to suffer from the Scribes and Pharisees, and the Death he is to undergo at *Jerusalem*; and when One of his Disciples offers to dissuade him from dying, he

smartly

smartly rebukes his indiscreet Zeal. *Satan*, saith he, get thee behind me, Thou art to me a stumbling-block. For, thou savourest not the things which be of God, but the things which be of Men. And lastly, when Jesus Christ was expiring on the Cross, he plainly shewed us, that his Death comprehends All, crying out with his last Breath, *It is Finished.*

And yet we may say, that if Jesus Christ is but a mere Creature, his Death is so far from being the most important Object of Religion, that 'tis even impossible to shew that it includes any kind of true Usefulness in it.

For first, if this be so, we cannot say, that Jesus Christ has suffered Death to deliver us from the Pains which our sins had deserved, because his Person being no longer of Infinite Dignity, his Sufferings are not so neither, and consequently they can never be equivalent to the Pains deserved by our Sins. Whereas Jesus Christ, as God-man, might suffer in the space of a few moments, what we deserved to suffer to all Eternity: but Jesus Christ, as mere Man, cannot give his Death an infinite Value and Dignity which his Person has not. Thus were the *Socinians* very sensible that according to their Principles they could not defend the Truth and Necessity of the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ, which is yet the Foundation of all the Christian Doctrine, and an Article of our Faith, so often repeated, and so variously exprest in Scripture, that we must renounce Revelation, or Natural Light, to call it into question.

This Satisfaction is first pointed out to us by the Ancient Types. Jesus Christ had been represented to us by the *Paschal Lamb*, which was Sacrific'd in *Egypt* instead of every First-born of the *Israelites*, and whose Blood sprinkling the

Door-posts of their Houses, secured them from the hand of the Destroying Angel. He had been represented by the *Scape Goat*, which was sent into the Wilderness, after 'twas loaded with the Sins of the People. He was represented by the Sacrifice which the Holy Priest offer'd for the Sins of the People in the day of the solemn Atonement : A Sacrifice upon which the Priest did in some sort make the Iniquities of the Sinners to pass; which he signified by laying his hands upon it. As then the Paschal Lamb ransomed every First-born, by being put in their Place; we must needs grant that Jesus Christ ransometh Believers by being sacrificed for them. Only we are to observe, that as those things which were but imperfectly shadowed under the Law, are accomplisht more really and truly under the Gospel, there is this difference between the *Paschal Lamb* and Jesus Christ, that whereas the Former was not a sufficient price to pay for the Life of a Man, and notwithstanding its insufficiency was accepted of God, because at that time the Business was not so much to give a Satisfaction which was agreeable to the Divine Justice, as to prefigure the Sacrifice that was to make the Satisfaction; Jesus Christ is, on the contrary, a worthy Ransom to redeem us, being one that may be put in our stead, without giving us the least occasion to fear his being rejected as one inferior to our selves, and being therefore called *The Lamb of God, which taketh away the Sins of the World*: *The Lamb of God*, according to the Stile of the Scripture, which gives that name to every thing that is Excellent, in its kind, as *The Mountains of God, the Cedars of God, a Garden of God, a Lamb of God*, that is, *the Lamb* by way of Excellence, the only Lamb which can make a

true

true Redemption. Jesus Christ is a *Scape-Goat* : therefore to fulfil the truth of this *Type*, he must be loaded with our sins, he must be made *Anathema*, he must become a Curse for us, and our Iniquities must be imputed to him. For, if not, why would we have him be represented by the *Scape-Goat*? what is there common to Jesus Christ with this Goat?

In fine, we can never apprehend the reason why the Sacrifice, which was offer'd for the sins of the People on the day of the solemn Atonement, was Typically and Mysteriously loaded with the sins of the People, nor why Jesus Christ is represented to us by this *Type*, except Jesus Christ were truly loaded with the sins of Mankind, and truly expiated them on the Cross. However, these are no pieces of Wit; nor arbitrary References that we have laboured hard to imagine, and that can be easily denied. The Writers of the New Testament, who were led into all Truth by the Holy Spirit, which they had received for that purpose, and were appointed to lead Others into it by their Preaching, do not leave us the Liberty to think what we please in this respect.

Indeed there is nothing more obvious than the Application they make of these Ancient Types to Jesus Christ; *Christ*, saith one, *Our Passover was Sacrificed for us. He bore our Iniquities on the Cross. He was made a Curse for us. It is the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the World. There is no Condemnation to those which are in Christ Jesus. He dyed for our Offences, and is risen again for our Justification. God is in Jesus Christ reconciling the World to himself. He was made Sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. He gave his Life a Ransom for our sins* : All which is conformable to the

Language of the Prophets, who teach us, *That with his Stripes we are healed; that the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him; that he hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows;* (for 'tis in a double sence that this last Oracle is applyed to him) *That he was numbred with the Transgressors, and that he made his Soul an Offering for sin; that he was cut off, but not for himself, &c.* Expressions so forcible, so numerous, so singular and so various, as that we cannot but infer from 'em, that Jesus Christ dyed in our stead and to pay our Debts to the Divine Justice.

And yet our Adversaries are oblig'd to disown this use of Jesus Christ's Death, as much grounded as 'tis upon the Ancient Oracles, and as much confirm'd as we find it in the Word of God. They must say, that Jesus Christ has no more suffer'd in our stead, than we suffer in the stead of one another. Let us see then what usefulness they find in Jesus Christ's Death.

Here they'll tell us, that the Blood of Jesus Christ serves to confirm the New Covenant, which God makes with Mankind through Jesus Christ our Lord. Certainly if the Death of Jesus Christ serves only to confirm the Covenant in the Sence this Expression is taken, there can be no Reason seen why this Death is lookt upon as the Principal Object of Religion. For, of all the Accidents which have happen'd to Jesus Christ, this is the least capable to confirm the Covenant. If we suppose that Jesus Christ dying in our Stead delivers us from the Pains which our Sins have deserv'd, there is no doubt but his Death assures us excellently well of the Love of our God, and admirably confirms his Covenant: but the moment you deprive Jesus Christ's Death of this use, I don't see wherein it's force consists either to assure us of God's Love,

Love, or to confirm the Covenant of Grace. The *Life* of Jesus Christ is of quite another efficacy to produce this Effect ; and those sensible and shining Miracles, which show that Jesus Christ is invested with a supernatural Power, do much more strengthen our Faith than the Sorrow and Pangs of his *Death*. Yes, you'll say, his Miracles are fitter to assure us of his *Power* ; but his *Death* is most capable to persuade us of his *Love*. To persuade us of his *Love* ? And wherein can an unprofitable *Death* be so capable to persuade us of his *Love* ? Was it ever known that a Wise Man should lay down his *Life*, without any other necessity, but to convince another he lov'd him well ?

But let us proceed to distinct Ideas of Things, and see what it is to *confirm the Covenant*, by showing what the *Covenant* it self is. The *Covenant* includes a double Engagement, one on God's part towards Man, and another on Man's part towards God. God engages himself to save us upon Condition of Faith and Repentance. We engage our selves to serve God, provided he vouchsafe us his Grace, and forgive us our Sins.

Now I ask, which of these Two Engagements is confirm'd by Jesus Christ's *Death* ? It is not the Engagement into which Man enters to serve God : for 'tis Mortification and Repentance, which confirm the *Covenant* in this respect, or (if you will) which are an assurance to God that Man will perform his Duty. 'Tis therefore purely the Engagement into which God enters with us, to save us, provided we believe and repent : 'tis, I say, this Engagement of God with us, which is confirm'd by Jesus Christ's *Death*, because his *Death* is an Assurance to us that God will be faithful to execute his Promi-

A Treatise concerning the

ses. All this is admirably well lay'd and sustain'd, according to the Supposition that Jesus Christ's Death is an Argument of the Love God bears us. For, we may conclude, that because God does us this Kindness, he will do us others which he promises us; nay, further, this Kindness must needs be greater than all the rest he has to vouchsafe us: for if 'tis not, it does not follow, that because God delivers up Jesus Christ unto Death, he ought to give us Salvation and Eternal Life. He that does a greater Kindness, will do a less: but 'tis not certain that he who does a less, will do a greater. If Jesus Christ is a mere Man and his Death is not a satisfaction offer'd to the Divine Justice for us, it follows first, that his Life is not so valuable as the Eternal Life of all Mankind; and consequently the Gift which is given us of the former cannot assure us we shall have the latter. It follows farther, that if Jesus Christ confirms the Covenant to us, and assures us of God's Love by his Death, he does it by that which has no manner of usefulness in it self; so far at least we may say: just like a Man that should stab himself upon no other occasion; but to testify to another how ardently he loves him.

Which, perhaps some will say, would hold, if there were no other Uses in Jesus Christ's Death but that: but we know that it profits us more than one way. Is it not certain that Jesus Christ suffering Death for his Doctrine, does thereby shew that he believes it to be Heavenly and Divine, and consequently his Death is also useful in that respect? I answer, first, that indeed Jesus Christ's Death seems to confirm this Doctrine; but this cannot be the grand Use of his Death: because if it was, the Scripture would take no notice of it in those places

places where it reveals to us the ordinary Fruits of our Saviour's Passion. Secondly, if this were the principal Use of Jesus Christ's Death, we may say, that his Death would be infinitely less profitable to us than his Life, because his Doctrine is much better confirmed by his Life than by his Death. His Life is all glorious with Miracles, which shew that the Doctrine he teaches is Heavenly; because Heaven does by a Thousand Miracles give him an unsuspected Testimony: whereas Jesus Christ's offering up himself to Death, does thereby plainly shew, that he believes the Doctrine he teaches, to be Sacred and Divine, but not that 'tis really and effectually so. Thirdly, his Death being accompany'd with his Pangs and Terrors raises more Doubts in our Minds, than all the Circumstances of his Life. But 'tis very proper to observe, that Jesus Christ is not the only Person that has confirm'd by his Death and Sufferings the Truth of those Things which he taught. This is common to him with all the Apostles, and an almost infinite number of Martyrs, who have suffer'd Death, and Torments more cruel than Death it self, to give their Testimony to the Truth of the Gospel.

But do we think it nothing to have given an admirable Example of Patience and Charity? which is what Jesus Christ did in dying. Therefore his Death, without being satisfactory, is nevertheless truly beneficial to us. This is the last and indeed the weakest Refuge of our Adversaries. Yes, I own that Jesus Christ has given in his Death an admirable Example of Patience and Charity; but then this cannot be said according to their Principles, but according to our Sentiment.

He has given such an Example of Patience as never had and never will have its parallel,

seeing he has not only indur'd the Pains of the Cross, but, which is infinitely more considerable, he has in some measure sustain'd the weight of God's Vengeance which our Sins had justly provok'd; having appear'd before him as our Pledge, drawn down the looks of his Wrath upon him, and been depriv'd for this purpose, during some time, of the Sentiments of his Father's Joy; a Privation so much the more sensible, in that the love which he had for his Father was perfect. Jesus Christ has bore up under all that Sorrow which seiz'd his Soul even unto Death, those inward Horrors, those unspeakable Terrors and Troubles which are the undoubted Sentiments of the Divine Justice when satisfaction is paid it. Who then can bear wondering at his Patience?

But who cannot likewise admire his great Charity? He suffer'd Death for us who had offended him, and such a Death, without which we had been condemn'd our selves to dye Everlastingly. This is perfectly true according to our Doctrine.

But according to the Doctrine of our Adversaries, it may be said, that Jesus Christ has neither given a great Example of Charity nor of Patience. Not of Patience; seeing an infinite Number of Martyrs have suffer'd both a longer time than he did, and a more painful kind of Punishment than his was, and a greater number of Torments, and with more apparent Constancy and Steadiness.

Jesus Christ suffer'd for the space of some Hours only; whereas there have been some Martyrs, who have suffer'd whole Days, Weeks, Months, and Years. Jesus Christ suffer'd the Punishment of the Cross; whereas there have been some; who have suffer'd boiling Oil, mel-

red Lead, the Sword, Flames, to whom have been apply'd Plates of Iron red Hot, who have been shut up in glowing brazen Bulls, who have been made to suffer a long Train of Deaths, by cutting off the Members of their Bodies one after the other, and who instead of shewing the least Sorrow, have discovered the greatest Transports of Joy in the midst of their Torments.

This is certain Fact, but infinitely astonishing. For in short, it strikes, shoots and challenges our Faith, and Natural Light, that the Perfect of Perfects should be abash'd at the sight of Death; and that his Servants, who have all their Strength and Power from him, should Triumph in the midst of Torments. The one is seiz'd with Sorrow even unto Death: but the other are transported with Joy. The one sweats Clods of Blood at the approach of Death: the others behold a Divine Hand wiping of their Blood and Sweat; for, as to Tears, they don't shed one. The one complains that God forsakes him: the others cry aloud, they behold God, stretching forth his Arms towards them. And what should be the Reason of this so surprizing Differences?

Certainly it must be either on God's side, or the side of Second Causes, or the side of the suffering Person. 'Tis not on the side of Second Causes, seeing the Torments of the Martyrs are, I will not say, so long and dolorous as that of Jesus Christ, but in some Cases a Thousand times more dolorous, and much longer than His. Nor is it on the side of the Person's suffering, seeing 'tis undoubted that Jesus Christ has incomparably more Strength and Holiness than the Martyrs. It must be then on God's side, who ministers abundantly more Comfort to the Souls of the

Mar-

Martyrs than to the Soul of Jesus Christ : and why so, if he does not look upon Jesus Christ as our Pledge, and considers him only as his Son, in whom he was well pleased ? He looks on him with more Affection than the Martyrs ; and as he looks on him with more Affection, should he not pour out into his Soul more Joy ?

But if the Martyrs have given a greater Example of *Patience*, I affirm, that they likewise have given a greater Example of *Charity*. For in this Case two Things are certain. First, that they suffer'd for the sake of those to whom they publisht the Gospel. *For which Cause I rejoyce, saith St. Paul, in my Sufferings for you, and I fulfil in my Flesh the remainder of the Afflictions of Christ for his Body the Church.* Secondly, that many of the Holy Martyrs having been both longer and more cruelly tormented than Jesus Christ, they were also put to severer Tryals, and made their Charity more Illustrious, it be true that the Death of the Martyrs has the same Uses in this respect as the Death of Jesus Christ.

'Twould be very strange, that Jesus Christ should dye to confirm his Doctrine, and to exemplifie his Patience and Charity ; and yet the Writers of the New Testament, who took care to observe to us the Uses of his Death, should constantly forgetting this Grand and Principal Use of his Sufferings, employ only such Expressions as denote his Satisfaction, as are these following ; *He dyed for us ; he was made a Curse for us ; he was made Sin for us ; he is the Lord our Righeousness ; he was made to us of God Righteousness and Redemption ; he redeemed us by his Blood ; he reconcil'd us to God by his Death ; he is our Propitiation by Faith in his Blood ; he bore our Sins on the Cross ; he was sacrific'd for*

he taketh our Sins away; he saves and redeems
by suffering Death in our stead.

But 'twould be more surprizing still, that
the Martyrs have suffer'd for us in the same
manner that Jesus Christ did, and in some sort more
properly and with greater success than he, the
Scripture should put so great a Difference
between their Sufferings and the Sufferings of
Jesus Christ. Was Paul, saith the Scripture, cru-
cified for you; or were you baptized into his Name?
Were we not baptized into the Name of Paul:
if the Doctrine of our Adversaries were true,
Paul must have dy'd for us in the same Sense that
Jesus Christ did.

'Twill here be to no purpose for them to an-
swer, that Jesus Christ was perfectly Holy and
innocent when he suffer'd Death, whereas the
Martyrs were not intirely so, when they suffer'd
their Torments. For, first, if the Martyrs
were not entirely free from Sin, they were in-
nocent however with respect to the Cause for
which they were tormented. Besides, the Sense
of a Man's Innocence does not use to aggravate
his Sufferings, but rather to support and com-
fort him in the Sence of his Pain. This Jesus
Christ teaches us in his Gospel: *Blessed are they
which are persecuted for Righteousness sake: for
theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye,
when Men shall revile you and persecute you, and
shall say all manner of Evil against you falsely for my
sake. Rejoyce and be exceeding glad, for great is
your Reward in Heaven.*

Neither must it be said, that the difference
which we have observ'd in this respect between
Jesus Christ and the Martyrs, came from this, that
Jesus Christ had been the first in running this
Race of Afflictions; and that those who give the
Example are always such as suffer most. For,
first,

first, it is not true that Jesus Christ was *First* Martyr. He tells us himself, that the *Prophets* were persecuted before him; and he supports the Courage of his Disciples by this Consideration. Besides, this might serve to justify a small difference between divers Sufferers: but it can by no means justify the profound Difference which is found immediately (if we only consider Things Eternal) between the Constancy of Jesus Christ, and that of the Martyrs. It was not long after Jesus Christ's Sufferings, when St. Stephen was stoned. This great number of Martyrs, which he had laid down before him, had not raised his Courage to that Divine and Heroical Steadiness, which shews upon this occasion. And yet, how much does his Patience surpass the Patience of Jesus Christ, who is the Pattern of it, if we are only to regard the Appearances of both? The one is in a profound Anguish; and the other full of transporting Joy, cries out, *I see the Heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right Hand of God.* Jesus Christ is afflicted without measure in his Thoughts of God. *My God, My God,* He cries out, *why hast thou forsaken me?* The other rejoices, and is transported with gladness at the mere sight of Jesus Christ; and the Joy which shines in his Eyes and on his Face makes it appear as the Face of an Angel. Now let any one tell us the Mystery of this surprising Difference.

We must not say, as do some, that Jesus Christ having a Body formed immediately by the Holy Spirit, and of a Constitution admirably well regulated, was more sensible of Pain than other Men. For, first, what Man will reply, that a Body ought to be more sensible of Pain, because 'tis formed by the Holy Spirit, or because 'tis

residence of Holiness and Innocence? Besides, Jesus Christ did not suffer in his Body, when he was in the Garden of *Gethsemane*; he only thought on his Sufferings; and yet the very thinking on them was enough to make him sweat great Clods of Blood in his Body. Further, he declares, that 'tis his Soul that is exceeding sorrowful even unto Death, and that before ever he could endure the least Pain in his Body. 'Tis the Desertion of his Father that is chiefly sensible to him; and 'tis his Soul that feels this Desertion: and when a Potion is offer'd him, to assuage his Pain, and to lay his Senses asleep, he refuses to drink of it: Yea, it evidently appears by the History of his Passion, that the Sins of his Body does not in the least ruffle the Temper of his Mind. He has as much command of himself now, as he had when he was with his Disciples: Witness those Words of his to his Blessed Mother, *Woman, behold thy Son*; and to St. *John* the Disciple whom he loved, *Behold thy Mother*: Witness also that Glorious Promise which he made the Penitent Thief, *Verily I say unto thee, this Day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*.

It were likewise to reply with as little Foundations of Reason, to say, that That which occasion'd the profound Sorrows of Jesus Christ was the Ingratitude of the Jews. For, first, it is certain that this Character is common to him with the Martyrs, to have publish'd the Words of Life to Ingrateful Men, from whom there is nothing else receiv'd but ill Treatment, and afterwards Death for a Recompence. Besides, that this is not the first time that Jesus Christ had experienc'd the Ingratitude of his Nation. Nay, it was not the first time that he had foreseen that this Ingratitude would run so high as to be the Death of him,

him. He knew that long ago : and had frequently and soberly foretold it to his Disciples himself. Further, except we have a mind to make another Gospel, we must be oblig'd to own that the Dissertation of his Father lay near his Heart. He lookt upon this Hour as a Hour of the Powers of Darknes, and was teify'd with the Ideas of the Divine Justice : his Language plainly discovers. And then the Ingratitude of the Jews was, I confess, a sensible Circumstance which might add *something* to Sorrow ; but can never be the Principal Occasion of those unspeakable Terrors and Anguish which he shews either at his Death, or in his Agony. In a word, if the Approbation of God ordinarily comforts those who suffer for Righteousness sake, could it not much better have comforted Jesus Christ ? And if the certainty of possessing an Eternal and Blessed Life makes the Martyrs not only lose a Temporal Life without reluctancy, but to leap for Joy and Triumph when they lose it : should not the certainty of not only living Eternally himself, but of making others to live likewise, fill Jesus Christ with an unspeakable Joy ? What ! shall Men who are accusom'd to love the Earth, rejoyce to leave it ? and shall Jesus Christ who loves only Heaven appear seiz'd with a Thousand Mortal Terrors as he is a going to Heaven ? Who can apprehend it ?

CHAP. V.

that the Sentiment of our Adversaries renders the Language of Scripture Obscure and Inconprehensible, False and Deceitful, Absurd and Unreasonable, Impious and full of Blasphemy.

THIS is the last truth we proposed to justify in this Section, and, in my mind, the principal and most Essential means to shew, that it is the Theology which we are engaged with, true, then Jesus Christ and the Apostles have led us into Errour.

But for the better understanding it, we shall rehearse the Passages of Scripture, which we design to quote upon this occasion, to three principal classes. The first contains those which shew the Original of Jesus Christ; the second comprehends those which prove his *Pre-existence*: And the Third those which sensibly discover the Glory of his Divinity. Of these in their Order.

The Passages of Scripture which specify the Original of Jesus Christ are pretty numerous: such are these following, *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* John 6. *I am the bread which came down from Heaven. No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven. He that cometh from above, is above all: He that is of the Earth is Earthly, and speaketh of the Earth, he that cometh from Heaven is above all. The first Man being of the Earth, is Earthly. The second Man is the Lord from Heaven: he came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. I proceeded from the* Chap. 3. 13 Ibid. ver. 31. 1 Cor. 15. 47. John 6. 38. the

John 16. *the Father, and came into the World; and now*
 28. *leave the World, and go to the Father. I came from*
 John 8. *God; neither came I of my self, but he sent me*
 42. *Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he*
 Eph. 4. 9. *descended first into the lower parts of the Earth*

In which Passages (as they are explained by our Adversaries) we can find neither Sence, Truth, Reason, Wisdom, nor Humility: But we find the contrary Characters. For, all that we find in Jesus Christ, considered as a mere Man by his nature, is first, that he had a Soul form'd immediately by God: Secondly, that his Flesh was purified by the working of the holy Spirit. Thirdly, that he received the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which were necessary to him in order to perform the Functions of his Ministry, and that he received them in an Extraordinary measure. And fourthly, that he was invested in his Office and sent to Men by God. Now it does not appear to us, that all these things can ever establish the truth of those Expressions which we have mentioned above. For, if because the Soul of Jesus Christ was immediately created by God, it follows, that Jesus Christ may be said to have Descended from Heaven, to be come from Heaven, to be proceeded from God, to be the Bread which came down from Heaven, to have been in Heaven from the Beginning: These are such Praises as all Men may have a share in. It may be said of every one of us, that he has a Spirit which returns to God that gave it. Thus it might be said of every one of us, *What and if you see him ascend where he was before? I came down from Heaven. I came from the Father, and came into the World, and now I leave the World, and go to the Father, &c.*

Much the same thing ought to be said of Jesus Christ's Body having been formed immediately by the Power of the Holy Ghost: This is not sufficient

ficient to give ground to all these Expressions: *I came down from Heaven. I came from God. I was before in Heaven.* This is apparent, in that *Adam* was formed, as to his Body, immediately by the Hands of God: And yet the Scripture does not only not speak of *Adam* in that manner, but makes use of a Language quite contrary to it.

The first Man being of the Earth, is Earthy. The second Man is the Lord from Heaven. Besides, the Figure would be somewhat violent, if Jesus Christ were said to be *come from God*, to be *come down from Heaven*, and to have been *before in Heaven*, only because the Body of Jesus Christ was formed by the Holy Ghost.

'Twill be said, that Jesus Christ was not only Divinely conceived, but he was also replenisht with the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Ghost, and in that respect, he may be said to be *Come from God*, or *come down from Heaven*, because 'tis a Divine Work, either a Man replenisht with the Graces of God, or raised up in a Divine manner; or in Socin. much the same sence as *Every good and every perfect Gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights*; or in the sence that Jesus Christ asked, *whether the Baptism of John was from Heaven, or from Men*; and in an opposite sence to the sence of those words of an Apostle: *This wisdom descended not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devillish.* Several reasons shew us the Inequality of this comparifon. First, there is a vast difference between speaking thus of some Qualities which are not properly and of themselves susceptible of Local Motion, and of which consequently, it cannot be said but in a Figurative sence, that they Go, they Come, they Ascend, they Come down; and between speaking thus of some Persons, who being susceptible of this Local Motion in a proper and literal sence, may be

M

said

said to Ascend and Descend without a Figure. Besides, 'tis plain from the circumstances of a Text, from what follows and what goes before, from the Scope of the Discourse, and from the manner and quality of the Expressions, that these words, which are produced as Examples, ought to be taken in a *Figurative* and *Metaphorical* sence; whereas all these things give us to understand that Jesus Christ is said to be come down from Heaven in a *proper* and *literal* sence. For, who does not see that by these Words, *What and if ye see the Son of Man ascend where he was before*, is meant such an Ascension as is Local and properly so call'd? And who can doubt, that if the Word *ascend* is *Literal*, the words which immediately follow, are not so too; *Where he was before*? Who can doubt, that in these words, *I proceeded from the Father, and came into the world; and now I leave the world, and go to the Father*? Who, I say, can doubt, that according to the natural Sence of these words Jesus Christ came not into the World, and came not down from the Father, in the same sence that he was to leave the World, and to go to the Father? So that being gone to his Father, and having left the World in a proper and literal sence, it also follows, that he properly and truly came down from his Father. In fine, if those who receive the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, or who are sent of God, or who are the peculiar Work of his Efficacy and Power, might be said to be come down from Heaven, nothing could be more reasonable and just than to affirm all that of the Holy Apostles. For, it may be said of them, that they received the Spirit of God coming from above, and that in a very extraordinary measure; that they were divinely sent; and may be considered, either in respect of their

Rege-

Regeneration, or in respect of their Ministry, as being in a most particular manner the Work of God. And yet 'tis certain, that the Scripture never says they came down from Heaven: much less can it be said, that all That is repeated in every Page of that Divine Book, and that these Expressions are confounded with others that are Proper and Literal. Besides that, *John* the Baptist was Holy in several respects, and in several manners, the Work of God, Holy from his Mothers Womb, fill'd with the Holy Ghost, and sent of God, formed and raised up in a most extraordinary manner. And yet it is not only not said of *John* the Baptist, that he came down from Heaven; but tis said, that he is of the Earth. *He*, saith He himself, *that came from above is above All. He that is of the Earth, is Earthy, and speaketh the things of the Earth. He that came from Heaven is above All.*

The Enemies to the Divinity of Jesus Christ being hereupon unable either to satisfy others, or themselves, pretend to disengage themselves from this difficulty by saying, that Jesus Christ ascended into Heaven after his Birth and Conversation upon Earth; and that after he had been some time there to be instructed in the Truths which he was to teach Mankind, he came down from thence to fulfil the Duties of his Ministry: And this they will have to be the Foundation of all those different ways of speaking, which have in 'em some what extraordinary and surprizing. All which is soon said, and sooner imagin'd: But when we come to examine this supposition, we shall find it contrary to Truth, and Probability it self.

For first, whence had they this Account? From the Testimony of any Historian, or of one of the Evangelists? If so, they would very much ob-

lige us to shew it. Or do our Adversaries make it themselves, because they could wish it were so, that they might be better able to defend their own Hypotheses? If this be all, they have very good reason to suspect their Principle, and we much more. But, to speak the Truth, 'twould be of very ill consequence, if, every time that we met with any Expressions in Scripture, which would not agree with our Sentiments, we were allowed to forge a History at pleasure, and to defend it with is much Zeal, as if it were a part of Revelation.

And indeed, if Jesus Christ did ascend bodily into Heaven, there was a great Miracle even in that. But, how is it possible for us to believe, upon the bare Credit of our Adversaries, a great Miracle which was never reveal'd to us? If Jesus Christ did ascend into Heaven, this Ascension, which our Adversaries do otherwise believe so Necessary, ought to make a considerable Part of his History; and 'tis at least of as much Importance as *Elizabeth's* Visit to *Mary*, as the Arrival of the *Wise Men*, as the Conduct of *Heord* troubled at their Arrival, as the Description of the Food and Raiment of *John the Baptist*, as the Account of Jesus Christ's Journey to *Jerusalem* at Twelve Years of Age, as his Presence at the *Marriage in Cana*, not forgetting the Miracle he did there, as the *Temptation* of Jesus Christ in the Wilderness: And it was at least as necessary for our Edification, that the Historian should represent to us Jesus Christ caught up by the Spirit into Heaven, as to represent him in the Arms of the Devil, putting him sometimes on the Battlements of the Temple, and sometimes carrying him up to a high Mountain. Methinks, 'twas of as much importance to tell us, that he had been some time in Heaven, as to represent him to us sojourning in the Ci-
ty

ty. of *Nazareth*; and if 'twas so necessary not to passover in silence the opening of the Heavens at his Baptism, and the Dove that descended from Heaven (which was the Symbol of the Holy Ghost,) it was no less necessary to inform us that Jesus Christ had been taken up Bodily into Heaven. And indeed our Adversaries, (who will have the abode which *Moses* made on Mount *Sinai* whilst God was instructing him in what he had to say to the people of *Israel*, to be a *Type* of that Abode which Jesus Christ made in Heaven, when he ascended up thither to be instructed in the Will and Counsel of God,) ought to consider that 'tis very unlikely the *Type* should be exactly drawn in the History of the Old Testament, and that the Truth which answers this *Type* (which is ten thousand times more considerable than the *Type* it self) should be covered with the Vail of silence. And to what Principle could we attribute this silence upon so important a Case, in Historians who relate Matters of far less Consequence? But I express myself very weakly. I do affirm and maintain, that next to Three or Four Grand Events, which are, the *Death* of Jesus Christ, his *Resurrection*, and his *Ascension* into Heaven (which are the Ground and Substance of the Gospel,) there was no One thing in the History of Jesus Christ of greater importance to know, or more considerable among the Events of his Life, than the thing in Question before us. I don't except the *Transfiguration* of Jesus Christ upon Mount *Tabor*: Which is an Event that the Evangelists unanimously relate with all its Circumstances. For 'tis much finer, and more necessary to consider Jesus Christ ascending into Heaven to converse more familiarly with his Father, than to behold him upon Mount *Tabor* conversing with

Moses and Elias about the Event of his Sufferings.

What now can be said to excuse the Silence of the Evangelists on this Occasion? Shall we say, that these sacred Historians proposed only to give us the History of Jesus Christ's *Humiliation*, and therefore pass'd over in silence an Event which seems rather to relate to his *Glorification*. This Principle is False. The Evangelists don't forget One of the most Glorious Circumstances of the Birth, Life, Death or Resurrection of their Divine Master. At his *Birth*, he is praised by the Heavenly Hosts, and some time after he is worshipt by the Wise Men. In the time of his *Life* he commands the Winds, Tempests, Devils, Diseases, and Death it self; and goes up into a Mountain to be transfigur'd before Three of his Disciples. In his *Agony* he is succour'd by the Angels. At his *Death* he opens the Tombs and Graves, rends the Veil of the Temple, and extinguishes the very Light of the Day. At his *Resurrection* the Angels of God roll away the the Stone from his Sepulcher, and appear unto those that look for him. And when he ascends up to Heaven, the Clouds descend and carry him up Triumphantly into the Mansions of Glory. So that we must renounce our Natural Light, if after this we say, that the Evangelists took no notice of this *First* Ascension of Jesus Christ into Heaven, because they had no other Design but to speak of his *Humiliation*. But if this be not the thing they say, what can they ever invent to justify so extraordinary, so unnatural, and so incomprehensible a silence?

But after all, I would here ask our Adversaries, what necessity they conceive there was that Jesus Christ should ascend into Heaven? For, since their Opinion in this respect is not grounded up

on any report of the Evangelists, they must needs establish it on some kind of necessity. *Socinus* says two Things upon this occasion. First, that it was necessary that Jesus Christ should be conformable to *Moses*, who was his Type, and that as *Moses* had been some time with God on the Mount, it was necessary that Jesus Christ, should be some time with God in Heaven. And he adds, Jesus Christ was oblig'd to go up into Heaven, that he might be more particularly instructed in the Truths which he was to teach Mankind.

But to begin with the Confutation of this last Answer, methinks local Motion is very little necessary to make one capable of being taught of God. The Apostles were not taken up Body and Soul into Heaven. And yet they were perfectly instructed in the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven: and their instruction must needs have been full and intire, since the Books which they writ are made the Rule of our Faith. But if it was necessary for the Disciples of Jesus Christ to ascend up into Heaven, to be instructed in the Truths of Salvation, much less was it necessary for Jesus Christ to ascend thither, who had receiv'd, without measure, the Spirit of Wisdom and of Truth; and who being Holy from the time of his Conception, stoppt the Mouths of the Doctors at twelve Years of Age. Again, St. *John* did not ascend up into Heaven to know the Mind of God; and yet, when he sees Jesus Christ coming to his Baptism, he cries out, *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the Sins of the World*: Which Words do contain in them a most distinct Idea of the Mysteries of Religion, and may be consider'd as a most Perfect Abstract of the Gospel. And why should the Master have more trouble to be instructed, than the Servant?

There was no absolute Necessity, some will say, that Jesus Christ should ascend into Heaven to learn the Will and Counsel of God: but 'twas only such a Necessity as by which Jesus Christ must have been conformable to *Moses*, who was his Type. For as *Moses* was Mediator between God and the People of *Israel*; so Jesus Christ is Mediator between God and Believers: As *Moses* declar'd to the *Israelites* God's Design to redeem them from their *Egyptian* Bondage; so Jesus Christ has declar'd to Mankind the Merciful Counsel of God, namely, to redeem them from Everlasting Damnation and Death. But 'tis amazing that Men of so celebrated Parts and Learning, should reason with so little justness. Why then, if I do but fancy there are such and such Relations in the Old Types, this gives me full warrant to make what Addition I please to the History of the Gospel! I must therefore henceforward say, that Jesus Christ was of a stammering Tongue, because *Moses* was. Jesus Christ must have been a Shepherd, and also a Murderer; because *Moses* was both. No; will our Adversaries say, that is not necessary, because all these things do only respect the particular Person of *Moses*, and not his Quality of Mediator. It is not what happens to *Moses*, considered as *Moses*, but what happens to him considered as a Type, which is to be accomplisht in Jesus Christ. But 'tis certain, that *Moses* was with God on the Mount, not as *Moses*, but as Mediatour.

But if we may be allowed to over-stretch the Relations which may be in the Types, what is there that we cannot maintain? *Moses* went up twice upon the Holy Mountain to be instructed in the Law: must we say that Jesus did also go up twice into Heaven? *Moses* fast'd forty

ty Days and forty Nights upon the Mount, and fasted twice : must we say, that Jesus Christ went to fast twice in Heaven during this space of time ? *Moses*, when he came down from the Mount, broke the Tables of the Law : must we say the same thing of Jesus Christ ? *Moses* when he came down from the Mount a second time, brought with him other Tables, which were not to be broken : does this also agree to Jesus Christ ? When *Moses* came down from the Mount, his Countenance was so bright, that the *Israelites*, being not able to bear the Lustre of it, he was forc'd to put a Veil over his Face that he might converse with them : will any one also say that the Face of Jesus Christ did shine as the Sun when he was come down from Heaven, and that he was forc'd to veil his Face ? I don't believe any one would carry the Parallel so far. And consequently 'tis reasonable to grant, that as the Relations of the Types may not be carried to any Excess ; it is not lawful to ground the Truth of a Fact that is otherwise unknown, upon such Relations as, except they be hinted at in Scripture, may pass for Flights of our Fancy.

It appears then that this supposition of our Adversaries, who would have Jesus Christ to be ascended bodily into Heaven before he manifested himself to the World, is entirely False. But if we grant that it were True, their case would be ne're the better for it ; since this Principle is not able to justify all those Expressions, which intimate that Jesus Christ *came*, or *came down from Heaven*.

For first, if Jesus Christ did ascend into Heaven, he was there but for some time, and did not ascend thither as to a place where he fixt his ordinary Abode, which can be only meant of his Second Ascension. How then does the Scripture say,

say, that he was to ascend where he was before. Where he was before: Can this be spoke of a few Days of Abode which Jesus Christ made in Heaven? St. Paul was caught up to the Third Heaven. But could it be said at his Death, his Soul was going where he was before? Jesus Christ went up to Jerusalem at the Solemn Feasts; and we are told in the Gospel that he went up thither at Twelve Years of Age: could it be said of him the second time he went, Jesus Christ goeth where he was before? Would not this Language be fallacious, and intimate as if Jesus Christ had made his Abode at Jerusalem before? And Lastly, to make use of an Example which our Adversaries are acquainted with: could it be said of Moses, when he was seen to go up the Mount a 2d. time, that he was going up where he was before?

Secondly, 'tis observable that the Scripture does not use to say, that Jesus Christ went up to Heaven, but that he came down from Heaven, that he came from Heaven, that he came from God, that he came forth from his Father, and that he was to go to him even as he came from him: which Expressions shew plainly, that Jesus Christ came down from Heaven, as from his natural Place; and not that he went up into Heaven by a Miracle above Nature, to be there only for some few Hours or Days. And indeed the Scripture does not say of St. Paul, that he came down from Heaven, that he came from Heaven, that he came from God, tho' this be all true: because it is not so much his Descent from Heaven, as his Ascension into Heaven, that is so wonderful and surprizing, as well as a very considerable and important Event.

If Jesus Christ did not ascend into Heaven but in the Sence of our Adversaries, it were much better to repeat to us frequently that Jesus Christ

Christ went up into Heaven, than to tell us so often that Jesus Christ came down from Heaven. For, that Jesus Christ came down from Heaven, is beyond all Question, if it be true that he went up thither, since we see him present before our Eyes: but, that he went up thither, is what we did not know, and therefore we should have been told it. 'Tis said of the Triumphers of Ancient *Rome*, that they went up to the Capitol; because this was the most remarkable thing in the whole Action. They never think of saying, *they came down from the Capitol*; because this Descent is not the most considerable thing in the Event. It was said that the Jews went up every Year to *Jerusalem* to worship there; this was necessary to be known: but not that the Jews came down every Year from *Jerusalem*, tho' one was as true as the other; because it is not this Descent, to which our Mind is principally to attend. Thus, if it be true that Jesus Christ went up into Heaven, and came down from Heaven a little after he had been gone thither, it was incomparably more necessary to mention his Ascension than his Descent. And yet the Scripture speaks commonly of the latter, but says nothing of the former.

But we can easily illustrate it by an Example. Suppose then, we met with a Stranger, who should talk to us after this manner: *I came from Japan: I go to Japan. Ye shall soon see me return where I was before. I departed from Japan, and I landed in this Country, not to do my own Business, but the Business of the King of Japan. Ye are all of this Country; but I am of Japan. I came from the King of Japan, and landed in this Country, and also I leave this Country, and I go to the King of Japan; for he sent me. Now that I am to return thither, what is it but that I was sent into this*

this Country? He that is of this Country, speaketh as the Men of this Country: but a Man that cometh from Japan, speaketh as one come from Japan. None of you was ever at Japan, except my self who came from Japan, and who reside (or simply) who am in Japan. I appeal to the Conscience of our Adversaries, and I take all Mankind to witness the natural Impression which these Words ought to make upon our Mind. Do these Words naturally raise in us this Thought, that he who thus speaks is an *European*, a Man of this Country that has been at *Japan* about a Fortnight or a Month, and is speedily to return thither? Or do they give us to understand that he is a Native of *Japan*, and dwells there as in his natural Place and Country, and is speedily to return to his own Countrymen? Certainly it is natural for such a Man to say, and to say over again, that he came from *Japan*, that he came forth from *Japan*, that he is of *Japan*; but as for an *European* who had been there but a Fortnight or a Month, he would say, and say over again, that he had been as far as *Japan*, that he had been at *Japan*, and that he had seen *Japan*.

Thirdly, 'Tis observable, that the Scripture exalts Jesus Christ above all, precisely for this very reason, because he came from above. Which is a very good reason, and very well concludes (according to the supposition that Jesus Christ comes from Heaven as one who is (if I may say so) a Native of it,) that he comes from Heaven, as from his Natural Place and Country: but 'twill never conclude any thing according to the supposition that Jesus Christ comes from Heaven after he had been Miraculously ascended thither, and had been there some time; or if it is conclusive, we may by the same reason say, that St. Paul (who had the same Honour) is also above all,

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Jesus Christ does not content himself with saying, that he came from Heaven; but he gives the reason of this Descent. *I came not, saith he, To do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me.* Jesus Christ troubles himself to give the reason why he came down from Heaven, and never thinks of telling the reason why he went up thither. 'Tis a perverting of Language and Common Sense, if the Principle of our Adversaries is True. For, 'tis just as if Moses came and told the Children of Israel, without ever letting them know that he went up to the Mount, and conversed with God: *I came down from the Mount for such or such a Reason.* For, they might very well say to him: The Mount was not the Place of your Abode; we are surprized at your going up thither, but we don't at all wonder at your coming down. Tell us first, why you went up; and afterwards you shall let us know why you came down.

Fifthly, 'tis observable, that the Apostle makes an opposition between the *First* and the *Second* Adam in these Terms: *The first Man being of the Earth, is Earthy, but the second Man is the Lord from Heaven.* As then the Earth is the Natural Place of the first Man; so Heaven must be the Natural Place of the Second. As these words, *The first Man being of the Earth*, do not merely signify that the first Man was for some moments fastned to the Earth, and was afterwards raised out of it; but that before he was invlivened by the Breath of God, he had been always in the Earth as in his Original, or Natural Place: So likewise these words, *The second Man from Heaven*, do not merely signify that Jesus Christ is of Heaven, because he came from Heaven after he had been there some Moments; but that before

fore he came down upon the Earth, he had been always in Heaven as in his Original or Natural Place.

From all which foregoing Considerations it is evident, that those Passages become obscure and Unintelligible according to their Hypothesis, who pretend that Jesus Christ is by Nature a mere Man. And we shall as easily prove, that this Hypothesis renders them False, Absurd, and in some measure Impious or Injurious to the Deity.

Indeed they do naturally make on our minds these four Impressions. The *First* is, that Jesus Christ was before his Birth in Heaven, as in his Natural Place. For, what other sense could be given to these Expressions, *What and if ye see Son of Man ascend where he was before? He that came from above. He that came from Heaven. The second Man is the Lord from Heaven.* Now this Impression is false, if it be true that Jesus Christ is but a mere Man; and 'tis needless to stay to prove a thing so uncontestable.

Secondly, That Jesus Christ has Heaven for his Original in a much more particular manner than other Men. For, the Scripture opposeth Jesus Christ to other Men, in that others are from Below, and he is from Above. Others are of the Earth, and he is from Heaven. But this thought is also False, if Jesus Christ is by Nature but a mere Man. For, in this Case we must say, that we are from above, that we are from Heaven, in the same sense that Jesus Christ is; and that Jesus Christ is from Below, of the Earth, in the same sense that we are. Jesus Christ, as mere Man, cannot be said to be from Above; or from Heaven, but because he had God for his Original, or because God sent him, or because God designed to give him the Glory of Heaven, or because

God

God enriched him with his Gifts. But all this does likewise agree to other Men. God is the immediate Cause which produces their Souls. God did immediately produce the Body and Soul of the first Man. God sent the Prophets and Apostles, in like manner as he sent Jesus Christ. God designs to give the Glory of Heaven to all that shall believe in this Divine Saviour. And God hath always Sanctified his Believers, and filled with his Power such as have wrought Miracles. Thus, not one of those Characters being Peculiar to Jesus Christ, but being all three common to Jesus Christ and other Men, it appears to us that other Men may be said in the same sense to come from above, to come from Heaven, to come from God, as Jesus Christ is. To which may be added, that Jesus Christ is *from Below, of the Earth*, in the same sense that other Men are. For, we are said to be from Below, to come of the Earth, because we are compounded of a Gross and Terrestrial Nature, or because our Body was first taken out of the Earth, having been framed out of the Slime. But Jesus Christ has a corporal Nature as well as we; and Jesus Christ's Body was framed of the matter which came first out of the Earth, as well as Ours. And 'tis to no purpose to say, that it was refined and purified by the Operation of the Holy Ghost. For, the very Slime, whereof the Body of the first Man was made, was also fashioned by the immediate Power of God. In a word, Jesus Christ, as mere Man, may be considered two ways; either as a Man, or as a Messenger of God. If you consider him as a Messenger of God, I grant *He comes from God, He comes down from Heaven*, because his Call comes immediately from God: But as the Calling of the Prophets was herein perfectly like to his, (for that the Prophets were immediately sent of God,) it follows, that

that in this respect Jesus Christ comes not from Above, and is not from Heaven, but as the Prophets were. If we consider Jesus Christ as a Man, he came from Heaven either in respect of his Body, or in respect of his Soul. If you say He came from Heaven in respect of his Soul, because that was formed by the immediate Power of God : The same Advantage have all other Men, in that it is said of them all, *The Dead shall return to the Earth as it was : And the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it.* But if you pretend that Jesus Christ came from Heaven in respect of his Body, because that was produced by the power of God : This Character is common to him with other Men. If, because 'twas produc'd in a Miraculous manner, this is common to him with *Isaac* and *John the Baptist*. Or if, because 'twas produc'd without the Mediation of Man : This is common to him with the first *Adam*. Perhaps you'll say, that Jesus Christ is said to have come from above or from Heaven, because he had been filled with the holy Ghost. But this answer can have no weight here for several Reasons. First, because it is not only said of Jesus Christ that he came from above, but also, *That he was in Heaven before.* Now this last expression cannot signifie that Jesus Christ being upon Earth had received the Gifts of the holy Ghost. Besides that, the *Apostles* were Baptized with the holy Ghost : And yet were never said, *To have come from above, to have come forth from God, and to have been in Heaven before.*

The *Third* Impression that these Passages do naturally make on our Minds is, that Jesus Christ does not only come from above, and from Heaven in a Nobler sense than other Men, and than the first Man ; but also, that herein precisely the second *Adam*, who is Jesus Christ,

hath

hath a Glorious Advantage over the first *Adam* who is our first Parent. This is expressly declar'd in those words : *The first Man being of the Earth, is Earthy. The second Man is the Lord from Heaven.* But all this is false, if it be true that Jesus Christ is by nature a mere Men. For, according to that, He comes of the Earth, as the first *Adam* did ; and the first *Adam* came from Heaven much in the same sence as Jesus Christ did, which has been already proved.

Lastly, the last Thought that these Passages naturally raise in our minds is, that Jesus Christ did in some measure debase himself, because he came from a Place which was full of Glory, viz. from Heaven, upon Earth, which is the residence of obscurity. Now in that he ascended, what is it but that he first descended into the lowermost parts of the Earth ? Are we wont to say of a Man, who is by nature a mere Man, that he descended into the lowermost parts of the Earth ?

Thus it appears to us, that the Passages we have examined, do but naturally make in us false Impressions, if the Sentiment of our Adversaries be right. But to proceed a little farther ; it is proper to shew in the next place, that these Passages offer an absurd and ridiculous sence, if they are understood as our Adversaries understand them : for which end we need only consider them with their Comment. Our Adversaries explaining those words of Jesus Christ in *St. John* : *What and if ye see the son of Man ascend where he was before* , pretend that these words, *where he was before*, are to be taken Figuratively. Thy add, that Jesus Christ means here, *That the son of Man had been in Heaven before he ascended thither by his Resurrection*, not only because he was long before that continually in Heaven by meditation and thought : but also because he knew

in such a manner all Celestial things, that is to say, the most Divine Secrets, and all things which are, and are done in Heaven were so well known and manifest to him, that he saw them as clearly as if they had been before him; and thus, though he was upon Earth, yet was he also in Heaven. But how absurd and ridiculous does this Passage appear, when tis thus explained: *What and if ye see the Son of Man ascend where he was before in Meditation and Thought?* For, where can we find that to be in Heaven, signifies to think on Heaven? Why does Jesus Christ make use of a Verb that signifies the time past, when he ought to express the time present. And if when Jesus Christ utter'd these words, he were in Heaven, in respect of his Thoughts and Meditations, why does he not say, *What and if ye see the Son of Man ascend where he now is?* What is the meaning of this expression, *where he was before?* and what sense can we reasonably give this word *before?* By what Spirit of Divination could we know that Jesus Christ, speaking literally (as we all grant) when he says, *if you see him ascend,* the literal sense ends in the middle of the Expression, and that the rest must be understood Figuratively, tho' these two Phrases, *to ascend, where he was,* have such a relation one to another, that all Mankind would take them in one and the same sense, that is to say, both in a proper sense, or both in a literal sense? How can they help seeing here a tacit Opposition between the Place where Jesus Christ was before, viz. Heaven, and the Place where he was afterwards, viz. the Earth: So that, as he was upon Earth in a proper sense, he must have been also in Heaven in a literal sense? what Man did ever express himself after this manner, and say to us, *I am going to Japan where I was before,* meaning,

τι πρότερον.

ing, *I am going to Japan, where I was already in my Wishes or Thoughts?* Believers are exhorted to set their Affection on things above where Jesus Christ is : But 'tis never said, that they ought to ascend up where they were before. It may be very well said, that our Heart is in Heaven, where our Treasure is ; because the Metaphor is cleared by the other words that accompany it. But it cannot be said, without impertience and nonsense, what and if we shall be seen to ascend where we were before? meaning, where we were in our thoughts : Because there being nothing but what naturally directs to the literal sence in these words, the mind is shocked with a Metaphor it finds placed cross its way.

But let us proceed to examine these Passages with the gloss our Adversaries give 'em. These Words, *I came down from Heaven*, do, in their Opinion, signifie no more than this, *My Flesh was created and form'd by the wonderful Counsel and Power of God, and thereby it came from God himself. Wherefore, when 'tis said, that Jesus Christ came down from Heaven, no more is signify'd than that he came from God himself.* But then, how are these Words to be understood ; *The first Man being of the Earth, is Earthy : The Second Man being the Lord, is from Heaven ?* Adam's Body was form'd by the wonderful Power of God : Therefore he came from God in this Sence ; therefore he came down from Heaven. Besides, who does not see that these Words, *I came down from Heaven, not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me*, signifie quite another thing from, *My Flesh was form'd by the Power of the Holy Ghost.* For there is here a sending antecedent to a coming down, and a coming down consequent to a sending.

To all which must be added, that this Language would not be agreeable either to Modesty,

or to the Respect we owe to the Deity. First, if Jesus Christ be but a mere Man, he comes of the Dust and the Earth as well as the first Man. Secondly, it cannot be said of a mere Man, *But the second being the Lord is from Heaven.* We do not speak thus of a Man, who belonging naturally to the Earth, is made Heir of Heaven only by Grace. On the contrary, to speak agreeably to Truth and Modesty, we should use a Language quite opposite to this, and say, Jesus Christ being of the Earth is by Nature Earthy: but by the Grace and Goodness of God he is made Lord of Heaven. Now as one cannot be void of Modesty in this respect without falling into Impiety, because one cannot herein attribute to himself any Glory, but what is robb'd from God: it is evident that the Language of the Scripture becomes not only Obscure and Unintelligible, not only False and Fallacious, not only Absurd and Unreasonable, but also full of Pride and Impiety, supposing that we were to adhere to their Opinion, who make Jesus Christ a mere Man by Nature. For, 'twas to confute this Opinion, that we made a particular Pause in this Chapter. The *Arrian* Hypothesis shall have its place in the other parts of this Work.

C H A P. VI.

A Proof of the same Truth, taken from those Passages of Scripture which denote Jesus Christ's Pre-existence.

THE Scripture gives us all these Ideas of Jesus Christ, viz. that he existed before he was born; that he was before *John* the Baptist, and in the time of the Prophets, who were even fill'd with his Spirit; that he was before *Abraham* was, that he was in the beginning of all Things, from the beginning of Time; and that he was before all Ages.

For, I. 'Tis said of him, that *He was in the Form of God*, and that afterwards, *he made himself of no Reputation to take upon him the Form of a Servant*: which shews that Jesus Christ did exist before his Humiliation, and consequently before his Birth.

II. The Scripture saith of him, that *he was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh*. This shews that there is a Nature in him distinct from the Humane Nature, in respect of which he was not made of the Seed of David.

III. He is called *God manifested in the Flesh*. This shews that there is, in this Carnal Nature which has begun to appear, a God who had not always appear'd.

IV. 'Tis said, that this Word, which was from the beginning, and which was God, *was made Flesh*. This signifies that the Word was before the existence of this Fleth.

V. Jesus Christ saith of himself, *that he proceeded from his Father, and came into the World; and again, he leaveth the World, and goeth to his Father.*

Father. Which is false, or else Jesus Christ must have been before he came into the World.

VI. Jesus Christ affirms with an Oath, that he is before *Abraham*: *Verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* Either he must have spoken falsely, or he must be before *Abraham was*: it being the Natural Impression of his Words.

VII. St. Peter, speaking of the Salvation that was brought us by Jesus Christ, saith: *Of which Salvation the Prophets (who prophesied of the Grace that should come unto you) have inquired, and searched diligently: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before-hand the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow.* We cannot truly say, that the Prophetical Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets, except we grant that Jesus Christ existed in the time of the Prophets. Jesus Christ has a Spirit which he sends on the Apostles, and a Prophetical Spirit with which he inspir'd the Prophets. Therefore he existed in the time of the Prophets, as well as in the time of the Apostles. This is convincing. For, to say, that the Spirit of the Prophets was the Spirit of Christ, because it prophesied concerning Christ, is to suppose that the Apostles are extravagant in their Depressions. The Prophets foretold the Coming of the Apostles: will you mean by this, the Prophetical Spirit of the Apostles which was in the Prophets?

VIII. 'Tis said of Jesus Christ, *That he was in the Beginning; that he was with God; that he was God; and that by him all things were made.* All this is false, or we must be forc'd to own, that Jesus Christ existed not only before his Birth, but also before the World was.

IX. 'Tis said, that *his Goings forth are from the Beginning, from Ancient Times, or from the Days*

Days of Old, to explain which an Apostle tells us, that he made the Worlds. It follows therefore that Jesus Christ was from the beginning of Time, and even before Time and the Worlds.

X. He makes this Prayer to his God, his Father, *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* Either this Speech is void of Sence and Truth, or else Jesus Christ must have been, and must have possess'd his Glory before the World was,

XI. Jesus is very frequently call'd in Scripture, *Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last.* Either this Title is attributed to him falsely, or it must be granted that Jesus Christ existed before all the Creatures.

And to judge of the Impression which these Passages naturally make in the Mind, we need only consider the Impression they have made on Mankind for so many Ages since the Scripture, which contains them, was compos'd. The *Socinians* may chuse what Arbitrators they please to judge of the simple and natural Signification of these Expressions. If they distrust the Orthodox, will they also dare to distrust the *Arrians*, who were no more prepossess'd in favour of the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ than they themselves? If the *Arrians* seem suspicious to them, will they distrust the Testimony of the *Mahometans*, who, together with the *Socinians*, reject not only the Doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but also that of his Pre-existence, and yet will tell them, they see the same in these Passages that we do; which obliges 'em to reject the Scripture of the New Testament, as being either wholly supposititious or essentially corrupted? I do not know whether we have not reason to think, that this is the secret Sentiment of our Adversa-

ries, when we see 'em bring such a number of Explications of Passages so different, and sometimes contradictory. It is not likely that the plain and natural Impression of these Words, *Before Abraham was, I am*, suggested to Socinus, the Interpretation, which he says himself, cost him so much pains, and labour of thought, and which God did not discover to him, till after he had begg'd it very earnestly of him, and had spent several Days in Prayer : after all, his Explication was never approv'd of by the Teachers of his Sect that followed him. And we need not wonder at it. For if Jesus Christ, by saying, *Before Abraham was, &c.* did mean, *I am, before Abraham was, what is express'd by the Name of Abraham*, that is to say, the Father of many Nations before the *Gentiles* became the Children of *Abraham* : we may say, that there was never any thing more fallacious, or more captious, than this Discourse of his. 'Tis also evident, that 'tis void of Truth, seeing this Expression, *before Abraham was*, does not signifie, *before Abraham was Abraham*, as this, *before Pompey the Great was*, does not signifie, *before Pompey was sumnam'd*, or *was in effect the Great* : but the meaning is, *before he that was honour'd with this Title existed, before he was in the World*. Besides, this Gloss of Socinus renders the Discourse of Jesus Christ full of Absurdity. For what mighty wonder was it for Jesus Christ to have been, before the *Gentiles* were become the Children of *Abraham*, since the same thing might be said of the meanest Person that liv'd at that time ? But a modern Socinian has hit it a little better, by pretending that Jesus Christ is before *Abraham*, in the same Sence that he is the *Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*. For, tho' this reply is very far from being satisfactory,

yet

yet certainly, it may be lookt upon as a plausible and lucky Evasion. But first, we may distinguish two Parts in the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, as we distinguish two Natures in him. The Corporal Part of this Sacrifice is, the Actual Oblation that Jesus Christ makes of his rent and dying Flesh on the Cross. And the Spiritual Part of this Sacrifice is, the Oblation in Spirit, that Jesus Christ makes to God his Father from all Ages. For, there is no doubt but *Abel's* Sacrifice would have been rejected as well as *Cain's*, had not the Eternal Son of God made it acceptable to his Father, by offering him at that time in Spirit the Flesh and Blood, which he was to take upon him in the fulness of Time to redeem us from our Iniquities. So that if the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not exist in his Corporal Part from the Foundation of the World, yet it existed in his Spiritual Part; which was the Sacrifice and Oblation made at that time in Spirit by the Son of God really existing. Add to this, that when we find any Figure in these Words, *the Lamb Sacrific'd from the Foundation of the World*, 'tis sufficiently explained by the Term *Slain*, or *Sacrificed*, by what follows and what goes before, and by the other Circumstances of the Discourse. But here every thing leads us to the literal Sense. 'Tis a very literal Objection that was made Jesus Christ in telling him, *Thou art not yet fifty Years Old*. In short, this Expression which denotes the Pre-existence of Jesus Christ *Before Abraham*, &c. has the Advantage to be supported by a great number of Expressions like it; which cannot be said of the other. For, to make all things even, we must suppose the Scripture tells us, that Jesus Christ being in the form of a Sacrifice, was afterwards pleased to be in the form of a Man; that he came from Suffering, when he came into

into the World ; that the Prophets saw the meaning of his Blood, and were sprinkled with it ; that the Israelites wagg'd their Heads in *Moses's* time, seeing him nail'd to a Cross ; that he dy'd before *Abraham* was ; that he departed in *Noah's* time, bearing his Cross upon him, and shewing it to unbelieving and impenitent Men ; that his Death and Crucifixion are from Ancient Times ; that he suffer'd Death before all Ages, and that Jesus Christ made this Prayer to God upon Mount Calvary: *Father, behold me, ready to indure the same Sufferings that I suffered with thee before the World was.* Would not you say that such a Discourse as this is, were full of Falsity, and even of Extravagance? Nay, would not you say so, tho' it were shew'd you that Jesus Christ is call'd the Lamb of God slain from the Foundation of the World?

But this is not all. The Passage quoted out of the Revelation to answer our Argument taken from a Passage in the Gospel, may be interpreted in such a manner, as it becomes unserviceable to our Adversaries. The entire Passage is this: *They then that dwell on the Earth worship him, (viz. the Beast mentioned before) whose names are not written in the Book of the Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the World.* Nothing hinders but there may be in these words one of those Transpositions which are so ordinary in Scripture, and even in all kinds of Authors ; and so they may be rendered by these : *Whose names are not written from the foundation of the World in the Book of the Lamb slain, or of the Lamb that was slain.* In effect, this expression, *from the Foundation of the World*, does naturally fall upon this, *written in the Book of Life* ; for the thing here spoken of is a Predestination from all Eternity, whereby a reason is given why the Inhabitants of the Earth are destroyed in Time by Worship-
ping

ing the Beast : But we don't see that it was at all necessary to speak here of the Eternal Vertue of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and to exalt it by this expression, *slain from the foundation of the World*. All the Difficulty we find in the Explanation that unites this expression, *from the Foundation of the World*, with the other, *Whose Names are written in the Book of Life*, lyes in this, that the word *killed* or *slain* does hereby seem to be out of it's place ; and therefore 'twere much better to say, *whose names are written in the Book of the Life of the Lamb*, than to say, *whose names are written in the Book of the Life of the Lamb slain*, or *that was slain*. But this Difficulty is nothing, if we consider that in the Revelation Jesus Christ is not only represented to us as a Lamb, but also as a Lamb Sacrificed ; and that 'tis under the last notion that he is treated so Gloriously. Thus the Four and Twenty Elders are represented to us singing *A new Song*, Rev. 5. and saying, *Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the Seals thereof : for thou wast slain, &c.* And a little after : *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, and Riches, &c.* As then 'tis under the notion of a Lamb slain that Jesus Christ appears in these Revelations, we must not wonder if it be spoken of such as are written in the Book of the Lamb slain, and not simply of such as are written in the Book of the Lamb.

Thus the Instance quoted by our Adversaries being now of no more Use, they must, whether they will or no, be reduced to one of those two answers already made this Passage, *Before Abraham*, &c. and either they must say, that Jesus Christ is before *Abraham* in the Purpose and Decree of God ; or that Jesus Christ is before *Abraham* was *Abraham*, that is to say, the Father of

of many Nations, before he was what it signifies by the Name of *Abraham*. But both these Answers are so weak, that we ought not to lose our time in confuting them. For, which sense soever you attribute to Jesus Christ, you make him guilty of the greatest Childishness in the World. Is it not a very surprizing thing, that Jesus Christ exists in the Decree of God before *Abraham* exists really? The same may be said of all Men without any exception, that have lived since that Patriarch's Time. Would it not be likewise a great Wonder, that Jesus Christ should exist before the Gentiles were become the Children of *Abraham*? This did agree to the least Doctrine of the Lord Jesus, and even to *Judas* that betrayed him. And was it to confirm such Fooleries as these are, that Jesus Christ made use of so solemn and forcible an Asseveration, in saying, *Verily I say unto you, before, &c.*

But admit there were some Difficulty in this Passage so clear, so express, and so bright, yet it were but just to explain it by so many other parallel Passages as evidently donote the Pre-existence of Jesus Christ. It is an easy matter to invent abundance of Subtilty and Distinction; but 'tis not so easie to satisfie one's self when 'tis invented. Thus when they tell me (as do some) that Jesus Christ was before the Prophets, and before *Abraham* in Excellence and Dignity; and that we understand of a Priority of Time (if we may be allow'd the Expression) what the Scripture speaks but of a Priority of Dignity and Excellence; my Judgment can never acquiesce in this Answer. For, how can this defend us from those Passages which say, that Jesus Christ is the First and the Last. He is the First in the sense that he ought to be the Last. He is not the Last in Dignity. It is not therefore a Priority

ty of Excellence that is here meant. For, how comes he to be represented to us without *beginning* of Days? How is it that he tells the *Jews*, when they objected his Age to him, saying, *Thou art not fifty years Old, and thou say'st, I have seen Abraham: Before Abraham was, I am,* And how can this little Subtilty skreen our Adversaries from the invincible force of those other Passages which speak of his Pre-existence with so much clearness? We cannot indeed examine 'em all in particular, because it would ingage us in a length we desire to avoid: but however we shall examine some of them with a particular care.

CHAP. VII.

Proof of the same Truth, taken from such Passages of Scripture as declare the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ.

THE first that offers it self is that in the 2d. Chap. of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians, which our Version has translated thus: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the Form of God, thought it not robbery to be Equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men. And being found in Fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became Obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross.*

Our Explication leaves every word its proper sense, its due place, and its natural signification; or we believe we may render them thus: *Who being*

being in the Form of God, being God, and partaking of the Divine Glory with his Father, thought it would be no Robbery to equal himself with his Father, and yet he made himself of no reputation in taking the form of a Servant, being born in a low Condition, becoming Man, and like to ordinary Men, and rendering himself obedient to suffer Death, even the Death of the Cross.

But we ought to make another Judgment of the Socinian Gloss, which changes the Word, Sence, and Natural Place of the Terms. Their Gloss is this : *Who being in the form of God, that is to say, who commanding the Creatures and the Elements when he was upon Earth, as if he had been some God, did not detain and obstinately keep his Equality with God, as do those, who steal something, keeping it close ; but he renounced this Equality with God, to make himself of no reputation, taking the form of a Servant in obeying, whereas he commanded before, being treated as a Slave, and becoming like to ordinary Men, whereas he was before in the form of God by the Power he was invested withal ; and shewing himself obedient, even to the Death of the Cross.*

All these expressions, *In the Form of God, to be Equal with God, he thought it no robbery, he made himself of no reputation, he took the form of a Servant*, do, according to this explication, suffer a manifest violence.

First, it is natural, when we find any singular Expression in Scripture, to explain it by other parallel Passages, or at least by such as have some affinity with it. This Phrase, *Being in the Form of God*, seems Extraordinary to our Adversaries, who therefore give it so studied Explications. 'Twould then be natural, if they had a mind to deal ingenuously, to compare it with other expressions that seem to signifie pre-

near the same thing. Thus St. *John* says of Jesus Christ, that *he was in the beginning*, and that *he was God*; and St. *John* explaining and paraphrasing this Expression, saith, that *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; and St. *Paul* gives us to understand, that before Jesus Christ shewed himself under the form of a Servant, and made himself of no reputation, he was in the form of God. Methinks we need not make any very great efforts of reasoning, to see that these two Passages are conformable; that he, who is called the *Word*, was God, and in the form of God in the beginning. So that as the Word was God, before 'twas made Flesh, as the Evangelist St. *John* gives us to understand: it follows also, that Jesus Christ was in the form of God, before he was made Flesh, and took upon him the Humane Nature, as St. *Paul* informs us.

We may boldly say, in the *Second* place, that neither in Divine, nor Humane Language can it be found, that *to be in the form of God*, signifies to work Miracles, or to command the Winds, Tempests, Discafes, and Devils. Whence had they so extraordinary a signification of this Phrase? Let them quote us some Prophet, Evangelist or Apostle that speaks after this manner.

Moreover, if to be in the form of God it were sufficient to work great Miracles in all the parts of Nature: We might say, that *Moses* was in the form of God; for he did astonishing Wonders in the Air, the Sea and on the Earth: And that the Apostles were in the form of God; for they wrought great Miracles, and even in some sence greater than Jesus Christ did, as was expressly promist them by that Divine Saviour.

Perhaps you'll say, that Jesus Christ wrought those Miracles in his own Name and by his own Power;

Power; whereas the Apostles wrought them in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the power with which he had invested them, as St. Peter told the Jews when he had heal'd the lame Man who lay at the Gate of the Temple. *Te men of Israel, saith He to them, Why marvel ye at this? Or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness, we had made this man to walk.* This Consideration is so far from abating the strength of our reasoning, that it does but furnish us with a *Fourth Proof*.

For if Jesus Christ did work Miracles in the Name and by the Power of his Father, I affirm that he was no more independant upon God, when he wrought his Miracles, than were his Apostles when they wrought theirs. If then the Disciples could not be said to be in the form of God, because they did nothing but in the Name and by the Power of their Master: So neither could he be in the form of God, because he did nothing but in the Name and by the Power of God.

Crellius de
uno Deo,
&c. lib. 1.
Sect. 1.

But if Jesus Christ did work his Miracles in his own Name and by his own Power, they contradict themselves in the grossest manner in the World; seeing one of the strongest Objections that our Adversaries believe they make us, is taken from this; *That Jesus Christ came, not to do his own Will, but the Will of him that sent him; and that he openly declared, that it was not he, but his Father, who was the chief Author of those marvellous works which he did; that his Doctrine was not his own Doctrine, but the Doctrine of his Father; and that he who believes on him, does not believe on him, but on him that sent him; that the Father was the true Author of Christ's Resurrection; that the Father does all things by the Son; and that the Son can do nothing of himself.*

Our *Fifth* Argument is taken from this, that the *Socinians* are not able to fix upon what time Jesus Christ was in the form of God, without contradicting themselves, or belying the Scripture. For either it was during the Thirty Years which he liv'd in the Quality of a private person, or it was after he began to exercise the Functions of his Ministry, and during the three or four Years that past between his Baptism and his Death. If it was during the Thirty Years which he past as a private Person, then the *Socinian* Exposition cannot stand; seeing during these Thirty Years we no where read that he did any considerable Miracles. But if it was after his Baptism, and during the Three Years of his Ministry, it follows, that he began to be in the form of God, soon as he began to humble himself, and to make himself of no Reputation in the profoundest manner, when he was delivered into the Hands of the Devil to be tempted of him in divers manners, being carry'd one while upon a high Mountain, and another while upon the Battlements of the Temple, &c. and when he began to suffer all the Inconveniences of Life, and all the Outrages of Persecution. Can we, without the greatest extravagance, term this Estate of extreme Poverty, Ignominy, and Affliction, a *Being in the form of God*?

Moreover, Jesus Christ did work no great Miracles till after he humbled himself. It was after he was found in a Manger at his Birth, after he had escap'd the Fury of a Tyrant that was greedy of his Blood, after he had fled into *Egypt* and had been brought up, at his coming out of Banishment, in an obscure City, call'd *Nazareth*, and after he had labour'd with his own Hands for Thirty Years in the sorry Shop of a Carpenter, that Jesus Christ wrought any great Miracles.

If then Jesus Christ was in the form of God, because he commanded the Creatures in working of Miracles, it follows, that he was in the form of God, after he had begun to humble himself, and to make himself of no Reputation : which is evidently contrary to the Text.

The uniting these two Expressions, *being in the form of God*, he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, or, as Socinus explains it, he did not obstinately detain his equality with God, will furnish us with a *Sixth* Proof. For it appears that Jesus Christ was in the form of God much in the same manner, and by the same Principle that made him equal with God. But he did not shew himself by his Miracles to be equal with God, either before God, or before Men : not before God ; seeing he did but the Works which God had given him to do : not before Men ; seeing he pray'd to God before 'em to shew them that God heard him, as he explains himself at *Lazarus's* Grave.

In a word, if Jesus Christ was in the form of God, because he acted with a Sovereign Empire over the Creatures ; it follows, that he was much more in the form of God at his Death than during his Life. For, during his Life he wrought great Miracles indeed ; but either he wrought 'em only before the three Priviledg'd Disciples, *Peter, James, and John*, hiding himself also from the Multitude upon particular Occasions, or else he wrought only private Miracles, whose Impressions could not be so publick : whereas, when Jesus Christ is on the Cross, he rends the Veil of the Temple, darkens the Lights of Heaven, cleaves the Rocks, opens the Graves, and raises the Bodies of the Saints, &c. All which are publick and most signal Miracles, and better shew us the Supreme Empire that Jesus Christ has over the Creatures than

than all the rest. And if so; whereas the Text, we examine, gives us to understand that Jesus Christ after having been in the form of God, made himself of no Reputation by suffering Death, and investing himself with a form quite opposite to the other: we must by inverting this thought, say, that Jesus Christ being at first in the form of a Servant, and having render'd himself obedient even unto Death, did, after he had made himself of no Reputation, take the form of God upon the Cross.

I pass over in silence the remark that may be made on the two Terms, *ὑπάρχων* and *λαβών*, as oppos'd to one another in the Apostle's Discourse. This Proof, tho' it be not so great as the foregoing, does not however appear to us to be contemptible. For when the Apostle speaks of the form of God, he makes use of the first of these two Terms, and says, that Jesus Christ *existed* in the form of God: which shews that this form was no accidental and transient form, but a form that was fixt and durable. But when he speaks of the form of a *Servant*, he is contented to use the latter of those Expressions, and to say, that he received it: which signifies not an essential and permanent form, but an accidental form; because he that receives a form is judg'd not to have had it always.

But as Scripture explaineth Scripture, we need not compare this Passage before us with other Passages of Scripture that signifie much the same thing, and we shall find out the true Sence of

For which purpose we must establish for the first Principle, that these Words, *who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation, &c.* do not merely import the Dignity and Excellency

of Jesus Christ, but import it in very forcible Terms. Then, to know particularly wherein this Excellency or Perfection consists, we need but collect the Passages of Scripture that shew the Excellency and Dignity of Jesus Christ, and by comparing them with him, endeavour to know wherein this form of God consists.

When we understand that Jesus Christ was in the form of God, was equal with God, and afterwards made himself of no Reputation to take the form of a Servant, we conceive two Estates, the one of Glory, and the other of Humiliation; an Estate of Glory that goes before, and an Estate of Humiliation that follows after.

When we consider these Words of an Apostle, *he was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh*, we have the Idea of Two Essences in Jesus Christ: One, in respect of which it may be said, that he was made of the Seed of David; and another, in respect of which can be said nothing like it: One which began at the Conception of Jesus Christ; and another which went before his Conception. Who does not see the Harmony there is between these Two Passages? For if Jesus Christ was before he was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh; he was in the form of Man, or in the form of God. He was not in the form of Man: for if he was, he must have been in the form of Flesh; and consequently would have been in the form of Flesh before he was made according to the Flesh of the Seed of David. But if he was not in the form of Man, it follows that he was in the form of God: and if so, who does not see that these two Passages perfectly explain one another.

But this will appear much more convincing when to these two Passages you add a Third, *viz.* that which expresses the greatness of the Mystery

ystery of Godliness, namely, *God manifested in the Flesh*. Jesus Christ was before he was in the Flesh. This appears in that he was made of the Seed of *David*, not absolutely, but only according to the Flesh. Jesus Christ was God, in that, God was manifested in the Flesh which was made of the Seed of *David*. If you have found out the Sence of these two Passages by comparing them together, you meet with no more Difficulty in these Words, *being in the form of God, he thought it no robbery to be equal with God; but he made himself of no Reputation, &c.* For it appears by comparing these three Passages together, that before the existence of this Flesh which was made of the Seed of *David*, and in which God was manifested, &c. Jesus Christ was God, in the form of God, and might consequently be reckoned equal with God.

To all which evidence you will add a new beam of Light, when you join to it these Words of the Saviour of the World : *I came forth from my Father, and came into the World, and again, I leave the World, and go to the Father.* For, it may be said that Jesus Christ, considered in the first Estate whereinto he came forth from his Father, and before he comes into the World, is not Flesh, is not yet made of the Seed of *David*, is not yet in the form of a Servant, and is not yet manifested in the Flesh. What is he then? He is the Son, or Issue, or the only Issue of his Father; he is that God who is to be manifested in the Flesh; and he is in the form of God. This Truth has already abundance of Evidence in it; but we must yet set it in a clearer Light.

C H A P. VIII.

Wherein the same Truth is further illustrated from several Passages in Scripture, which assert the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ.

WE can never understand any thing in the beginning of the Gospel according to *St. John*, if we once deny the Pre-existence and Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. All these Expressions: *In the beginning was the Word: the Word was with God: the Word was God: all things were made by him: the Word was made Flesh: the World was made by him:* I say, all these Expressions are otherwise no more than incomprehensible Nonsense; and Men, who are not obliged to understand what is in it self Unintelligible, are not to be blam'd for not discovering a sense so contrary to the Natural Impression of the Words, as cannot be discovered but by the Spirit of Prophecy. Which we shall now shew more particularly.

In the beginning was the Word. Our Exposition has nothing of Obscure or Perplex in it. For if this Expression is understood of the beginning of all things, then the Pre-existence of the Lord Jesus Christ and his Divinity are well established. I say, his *Pre-existence*: for from hence it follows, that Jesus Christ exists from the Foundation of the World. I add, his *Divinity*: because his infinite Power justifies this last, and if all things were made by him, we cannot doubt of his infinite Power.

But some have thought they have found out a means to defend themselves against this Evidence

dence, by explaining of the beginning of the Gospel what appears to have been said of the beginning of the World. They would have it, that the design of the Evangelist being to make known the Dignity of Jesus Christ from the very entrance of his Work, he apprehended an Objection might be tacitly made him that might prejudice this Design, viz. that John the Baptist was come, and had begun the Functions of his Ministry before Jesus Christ; and so it might seem that John the Baptist ought to be lookt upon as the Messiah, rather than Jesus Christ. They pretend that the Apostle destroys this Objection, by saying, that the Word, that is to say, Jesus Christ, was in the beginning, that is to say, when John the Baptist began to teach; that he was, I say, not only as to his Essence, but also as to his Office, &c.

They pretend that Jesus Christ is called the Word in the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John, by a Figure; that he is, I say, so called, or by a Metaphor, because as the Will of Man is manifested by his Word, so also was the Will of God discovered to us by Jesus Christ; which is likewise the reason that he is called the Way, and the Door, or by a Metonymy, being called by the Name of the thing that he reveals: in which sense he is also called the Truth, the Resurrection and the Life.

They add, that as some might think that in the beginning of the Gospel, when John the Baptist began to exercise the Functions of his Ministry, Jesus Christ was altogether unknown, and that so 'twas John the Baptist, and not Jesus Christ, that ought to be taken for the Messiah: St. John designed to answer this Objection, by saying, that he whom he calls the Word, was with God, that is to say, was known of God alone. They proceed and say, That this Evangelist does herein differ from the rest; that whereas the rest suppose, without proving it, that Jesus Christ is the Christ, unless the relation of

what they report oblige them in some measure to it; St. John, on the contrary, before he describes the Life of Jesus Christ, undertakes to prove, with an extraordinary Care, that 'tis He, and none else, that ought to be lookt upon as the Saviour of the World.

They pretend that Jesus Christ is called God in this place, first, because all things that appeared in his Ministry were full of the Deity. So that the Ministry of the Prophets which were before him, was rather a Humane than a Divine Ministry, if we compare it with the Ministry of Jesus Christ. From whence also it comes to pass, that not one of the Prophets was called God simply by reason of his Office, as Jesus Christ was in this place by reason of his Office of a Prophet.

They would have it, in the second Place, that he is called God, because he sustained the person of God himself; and lastly, because he was so appointed from that very time to the Power and Glory which he now possesses, that he could never be deprived of it.

They would have it, that when the Evangelist says, that all things were made by him, and that without him was not any thing made that was made, we must not understand by this expression, all things, all things in General, but only all things which do in any wise appertain to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to our Salvation, and to the Religion under the New Covenant; as the calling of the Gentiles, the abolishing of the Ceremonial Law, Miracles, and the several Gifts which were distributed in the Primitive Church.

They pretend that in these words of the Evangelist, He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not, the term World is taken in three different senses: So that the Evangelist says, that Jesus Christ was in One of these Worlds, that the other was made by him,

him, and that the Third knew him not. The *World* wherein Jesus Christ was, is the Society of Men. The *World* that was made by Jesus Christ, is the *World* to come, which is now present to Jesus Christ, and into which he was introduced after having acquired and formed it by his Obedience, and in which we shall be immortal and for ever happy with him, as many soever as we are that shall be found to belong to him. By the *World* that knew not Jesus Christ, must be understood Carnal Men, or Men that are entirely wedded to this *World*. To conclude, they pretend that when 'tis said, that the *World* taken for the *World* to come was made by Jesus Christ, we must not take it in an absolute sense, but in a particular sense, in which this expression signifies, that the *World* was made by Jesus Christ, because we hope to obtain it, and shall obtain it effectually by Jesus Christ. Or else taking the Term *World* for the Society of Men, whether when 'tis said that he was in the *World*, that the *World* knew him not; or when 'tis said, that the *World* was made by Jesus Christ: they say, that the *World* was made by Jesus Christ, because Men were renewed by him; and then *made* signifies with them, *new-made* or *re-established*.

Lastly, instead of translating these Words as we translate them, *the Word was made Flesh*, they render them thus, *the Word was Flesh*: thinking thereby to excuse themselves from acknowledging the Pre-existence of this Word. This then is their Doctrine: And now 'tis high time to make our Reflexions upon it.

C H A P. IX.

That the Socinian Gloss upon all the fore-mentioned Passages was only invented to elude the most express Passages that invincibly prove the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ.

THESE Subtile and Study'd Explications have so unnatural an Air, that we are presently sensible of it. They would have us, when the Evangelist says, *In the beginning was the Word*, to understand by the beginning, the beginning of the Gospel. This is to offer violence already to the Sripture, to pretend that this general Expression, *in the beginning*, signifies a particular beginning. For to say, that this expression ought to be taken in the sence that is assigned it by what follows, the Occasion on which 'tis uttered, and by other Circumstances of the Discourse; this consideration does wholly favour us. It cannot be said, that a particular beginning is meant here, since there is nothing goes before that determines the sence of this Expression, and also nothing follows after that shews that this Expression ought to be taken in a more particular sence, than it carries in it it self. For these words begin the Gospel; and are repeated by the Evangelist afterwards, without once particularizing the signification of them. We should be in the wrong to imagine that a mental Reservation were capable to determine a general expression to a particular sence. A man that designed to write the History of *Augustus*, would be very impertinent if he should say, *In the beginning was Augustus*, meaning no more than that *Augustus* was

or lived from the time of *Julius Caesar*. Or, to make choice of a properer example, if any one designing to write the History of *Moses*, and the surprizing things that God did by his Ministry, should think fit to begin his History thus : *In the Beginning was Moses, meaning he was from the beginning that God undertook the Deliverance of the Israelites out of the Land of Egypt* : Certainly, all these Mental Explications would not hinder his Language from being contrary to good Sense, because he would be Unintelligible.

If the Sence of the Evangelist had been what they give him, he might have naturally explained himself by saying, *Jesus Christ lived from the beginning of the Gospel* : and in this Case too his Phrase had had a very great Difficulty in it : For, we should be troubled to know what to understand by this *beginning of the Gospel*. If by this you understand the first glad Tidings that was publisht concerning the great Salvation which was to be manifested in Jesus Christ, you will find that Jesus Christ did not yet live in the beginning of the Gospel, since the Prophets were the first that publisht the Salvation of God : If you understand by this Expression, the time when the Oracles of the Prophets began to be accomplisht, we will ask you, why you don't understand by the beginning of this Gospel, the happy Tidings that the Angel brings *Mary* in these Words : *Mary, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee, &c.* To these glad Tidings of the Angel may be added those of *Zacharias* the Father of *John* the Baptist, who prophesies thus concerning his Son : *And thou, Child, shall be called the Prophet of the Highest, &c.* to say nothing of *Simeon's* Prophecy, which is so admirable an Abstract of the Doctrine of Salvation.

To

To this first Evasion they add a second, giving us some significations of this remarkable Term, *the Word*, which appear to us to be only invented out of necessity to defend their Cause. They say, that this Expression includes in it a Metaphor, or a Metonymy. But if they dealk ingenuously, they would fix upon one or the other. For one Figure were sufficient for this. But it seems, what would suffice in it self, does not suffice our Adversaries; and the mistrust they have of one of these Figures, makes them have recourse to the other. And it is not the Sense of the Scripture which they give us; but their own Prejudice, which they are resolv'd to defend.

This appears from that third Expression, *The Word was with God*. For, to take this Expression out of its proper Sence, and natural Signification, there might be several Senses given it, every whit as proper as the Sense which they have affixt to it. For if *the Word was with God*, or by God, can signifie, *the Word was known of God alone*; it may signifie more naturally, *the Word was hid in Heaven*; *the Word was below'd of God*; *the Word lived well, and walked with God, as did Enoch*; *the Word was disengag'd from the World*; *the Word did alone know the Counsel of God*. There were more natural significations of this Term; and yet they fix upon this, *he was known of God alone*; or according to others, *he was appointed of God to this Office*. And what should be the reason of this, but because they seek not after the true Sense of the Scripture, but fasten upon whatever offers it self to their Mind, or what defend their Prejudice.

And this is the Judgment we may make of that fourth Expression, *The Word was God*. Whatever they say to fulfil the Force and Dignity

nity of this Expression, which is so remarkable, is very ill invented. *The Word was God*, say they, because every thing in Jesus Christ was Divine, and the Ministry of the Prophets compar'd with his, was rather Humane. If this discovery had satisfy'd them themselves, here they would have stopt; but because they are sensible of the shallowness of it, they add, that Jesus Christ is also call'd God, because he sustain'd, or was to sustain, the Person of God. But this does not satisfy them yet: they add, that Jesus Christ was appointed to a Supreme Glory and Power, and that because this Power and Glory could not fail him, he is therefore called God. But what monstrous Ambiguity is this to suffer so different Explications of one and the same Expression; or what impenetrable Obscurity is it to cover in one Word so many things that are so difficult to be unfolded. Is it not because they don't so much intend to make us understand the Scripture, as to defend their own Sentiment?

I shall say the same thing of their manner of explaining these two Passages, *All things were made by him*, &c. *The World was made by him*. These two Passages are parallel: and yet they find out a way to render 'em very different. *All things* is explain'd by *the World*; *were made*, by *the World was made*. And yet they find the secret to put a prodigious distance between these Expressions: Understanding by *all things*, all the things that pertain to the Gospel; and by *the World*, the World to come, Heaven or the Society of Men: as they understand by *all things were made*, all things were wrought or produc'd; and by *the World was made*, the World was renew'd. It is very plain from this different way of explaining synonymous Passages, that they have

have no other design than to save their own Sentiment.

Which appears farther from their pretending that in the same place the Term *World* is taken in three very different and remote Senses; first, for the Society of Men; secondly, for Heaven or the World to come; and lastly, for Carnal and Profane Men. But if to understand the Scripture, we must take one Term in three different and remote Senses in the same place, what will become of us? and who is able, without a Spirit of Divination, to assure himself of having ever understood the Sense of the Holy Spirit. 'Tis very plain, that this is no pure Explication of the Scripture, but an Accomodation of the Scripture to our Adversaries Prejudices. But this is not all the fault that we find in their new Gloss.

Besides this Variety of Explications, which they give the same Expressions of Scripture, they attribute to the Evangelist diverse ends quite different; and, sometimes, quite opposite to one another. Which cannot come from any want of Judgment, since we must heartily acknowledge that we have to do with the most ingenious of all Writers; but from that confusion into which the necessity of defending their Cause throws 'em, notwithstanding the Opposition of several formal Passages in Scripture.

If we believe them, the Design of the Holy Spirit in the beginning of St. *John's* Gospel, is to answer an Objection that might be made upon *John* the Baptist's coming before Jesus Christ. But when they are urg'd to tell us, why Jesus Christ is here call'd God, seeing the Name of God was not necessary to distinguish him from *John* the Baptist: for every Perplexity, they have a new Evasion. They pretend, that the Evangelist think-

thinking no more upon *John* the Baptist, intends to distinguish Jesus Christ by the Name of God, from all the Prophets that went before him, whose Ministry was Humane, if compar'd with that of our Saviour. Here are abundance of Designs: but now let us see whether there be ever a true one.

The Evangelist is afraid that we should prefer *John* the Baptist to Jesus Christ, because *John* the Baptist came before him. By the same Reason he might fear, that we should prefer *Moses* and the Prophets to Jesus Christ, as having liv'd before him. But, tho' one should have been tempted to look upon *John* the Baptist as the Messiah, when *John* the Baptist began to preach the Gospel, this danger was over as soon as *John* the Baptist was put to Death, and Jesus Christ was risen from the Dead. But if the Evangelist takes care to let us know that *John* was not that Light, 'tis only to tell us in other terms, what the Scripture teacheth us elsewhere, that the Preaching of *John* the Baptist did indeed dissipate the darkness of Error, but was not sufficient to give the bright Light of the Gospel, being but as a glittering Candle in a dark place; whereas Jesus Christ was the Sun of Righteousness.

But let us suppose the Evangelist might fear lest any one should be so simple to prefer *John* the Baptist to Jesus Christ, upon the account of *John* the Baptist's coming before him: how does he answer this Objection? He holds his Tongue when he should speak, and speaks when he should hold his Tongue. He holds his Tongue when he should speak. He does not say, that the Servants go before their Master; that the Prophets were before the coming of the Messiah, tho' they were less than he; that we

we must not wonder that *John* the Baptist came before Jesus Christ, because he is the Fore-runner that was to go before his Face, and to make his Paths strait. He speaks when he should hold his Tongue. He says, that Jesus Christ was from the beginning of the Preaching of *John* the Baptist. Which is no manner of Answer to the Objection. For Jesus Christ was from that time, and *John* the Baptist was from that time : but *John* the Baptist exercis'd the Functions of his Ministry, and Jesus Christ did nothing. Which is the very Difficulty that the Evangelists should have prevented.

If we cannot find in the Explication of our Adversaries such Designs as are becoming the Holy Spirit, we meet with such a disorder and confusion in it, as can only agree to a Spirit that design'd to ingage us in Error, or that purpos'd to speak so as not to be understood. For, they would have it, that by these Words, *In the beginning*, is meant the Preaching of *John* the Baptist : and yet the Evangelist has not only not yet mentioned *John* the Baptist, but does not speak of him till he has done with the Encomium of the *Word*; and then does it in such a manner, as shews that he means to speak of him for the first time, saying, *There was a Man, whose Name was John*.

Moreover, it is said, that in this beginning (which they pretend is the beginning of the Gospel) the Word was, it was with God, and it was God. But nothing of all this did agree to Jesus Christ in this beginning. He was not at that time the Word; for he had not yet publisht the Counsel of God. He was not with God, at least in a proper Sense; for, according to our Adversaries, he was not translated into Heaven till after his Baptism. And he was not God;

seeing

seeing he had not been yet invested in his Offices, which make him represent God, and bear his Name.

'Twere a small matter to want Order, if the Words of the Evangelist did not also want Truth ; but to fix the Sense of our Adversaries upon 'em, we can hardly doubt of their Falsity. 'Tis however certain, that we may substitute contradictory Propositions in the place of those Expressions, which will undoubtedly appear more intelligible, and be acknowledged by their natural Impression for true, such as these are : *Jesus Christ was not in the beginning of the Gospel. Jesus Christ was not the Word from the beginning. Jesus Christ was not yet with God. Jesus Christ was not God. He was not the Word in the beginning. All things, even all things that respect the Oeconomy of the Gospel, were not made by him. Several things were not made without him, before him, and after him. The World was not made by him. The Word was not made Flesh ; but the Flesh was made Word. He is the Light ; but he is not the Light which inlightens every Man that cometh into the World.*

Jesus Christ was not in the beginning of the Gospel. This Proposition is certain, since the Embassy of an Angel to Mary gives the true beginning to this Gospel, which was afterwards continued by sending the Angel to the Shepherd of Bethlehem, to whom he thus speaks, *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great Joy, which shall be to all People, &c.* and afterwards by the Preaching of John the Baptist, and lastly, by the Preaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

Jesus Christ was not the Word, at least in this beginning, neither by a Metaphor, nor by a Metonymy. He was not so by a Metaphor. or, it could not be said at that time : *As the Word*

A Treatise concerning the

Word of Man discovers his Thoughts: so Jesus Christ manifests the Thoughts and Counsel of God. Neither was he so by a Metonymy. For Jesus Christ could not borrow that Name from a Word which he had not yet publisht, nor caus'd to be publisht.

Jesus Christ was not God in this beginning, in what Sense soever this Expression be taken. He was not God because his Ministry was Divine, as oppos'd to the Ministry of the Prophets; for he did not yet exercise his Ministry. He was not God, because he sustain'd the Person of God; for in this beginning he did not represent God in any wise. Nor can it be said that he was God, because he was appointed to a Glory and Power perfectly Divine. For, first, this is contrary to the ordinary Stile of the Scripture: which will never say, that *Saul*, for instance, was an Apostle, a Man Celestial and Divine, the Light of the Church, or the Teacher of the Gentiles, in the beginning of the Gospel when he was all on Fire with Threats and Slaughter against the Disciples of the Lord; because he was appointed to the Glory of the Apostleship. Or if you would have me use an instance that's less odious, you will not say that *Moses* was a Mediator between God and the People of *Israel* in the beginning, that is to say, from the time he fed the Cattel of *Jethro* his Father-in-law; and that the Sons of *Zebedee* were the Sons of Thunder from the time they did nothing else but fish with their Father.

To this consideration must be added, that the Evangelist's design being to make here the Encomium of Jesus Christ, it falls out that if the Sentiment of our Adversaries were reasonable, he would make the most equivocal Encomium of Jesus Christ that ever was; it being certain

that

that one parallel to it might be also made of *Moses*. There is nothing hinders but we may say in the Sense of our Adversaries concerning this Legislatour : *In the beginning was the Word. The Word was with God. The Word was God. He was in the beginning. All things were made by him : and without him was not any thing made that was made. This Word was made Flesh.* All which is as true of *Moses* as of *Jesus Christ* in the Sense of our Adversaries.

In the beginning was the Word. *Moses* was from the beginning that God manifested his Design to bring his People out of the Land of *Egypt*. *Moses* may be call'd the Word, both by a Metaphor, and by a Metonymy : by a Metaphor, because as a Word serves to express the Thoughts of Man, so *Moses* serv'd to make known the Counsel of God : and by a Metonymy, because *Moses* is the Minister of the Word, he brought it from the Holy Mount, committed it to Writing, made it known by the *Levites* who were appointed to instruct the People, and because he ought to take the Name of that Word, whereof he is the chief Herald. *Moses* was with God from the beginning. For, though he was unknown and despis'd of Men, he was known of God ; and besides ; he was honour'd with a Divine Revelation. He was God ; for he was appointed to represent God, according to those Words in *Exodus*, so often quoted by our Adversaries, *He shall be to thee instead of a Mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God.* Lastly, he was God in three Senses set down by our Adversaries. First, because his Ministry was all Celestial and Divine, in comparison of theirs who went before him, which was Humane and Terrestrial. For, there was no Prophet rais'd up like unto *Moses* in *Israel*, who beheld God familiarly,

and talk'd to him as a Man talketh to his Friend, according to the Expression in Scripture. He was God in the second Sense, because he represented God, was invested with his Power and Character, was his Ambassador, and spoke to *Pharaoh* on his behalf. He was God, lastly, because he was appointed to a Glory and Power perfectly and Divine; since he was to work most surprizing Miracles in all the parts of Nature. *All things were made by this Word*, if you hereby understand all things which belong to the Deliverance of the *Israelites*, and the Re-establishment of the Law.

This Conformity will appear the greater, if we consider, that as Jesus Christ did, in working his Miracles, act only by the Power of his Father; so did *Moses* act only by the Power of God in working of his. As all the Miracles which have signaliz'd the Gospel, were not wrought without exception by the Ministry of Jesus Christ, but only the greater Number of them; (for we cannot say, for instance, that 'twas Jesus Christ who sent the Angels with the Tidings of his Birth, or that kindled the Star which appear'd to the Wise Men, &c.) so also 'twill be said, that all the Miracles which have signaliz'd the Deliverance of the *Israelites* were not wrought without exception by the Ministry of *Moses*, but only the greater number of 'em. He did not kill the First-born of the *Egyptians*, neither did he cause the Glory of God to descend in the Cloud: but 'twas he, that by means of the miraculous Rod which he held in his Hand, did turn the Waters of the Red-Sea into Blood, that covered the Ground with Insects, and the Air with Darkness, that opened the Abysses of the Red-Sea, and fir'd the Clouds and Mount *Sinai*, that
caused

caused the *Manna* to fall, and the Waters to gush out from a Bosom of the Rock, that opened the Earth, made Fire to fall from Heaven, &c. And may it not be said that so many, so great, and so diverse Wonders having been wrought only by his Ministry, *without him nothing was made that was made* on so illustrious and memorable an Occasion. *This Word was made Flesh*, or it was Flesh. *Moses* was a Man, though he acted as a God. There is therefore no doubt but this last Expression belongs to him as well as the others.

And here our Adversaries are not a little puzzled. For if they grant that the same Language might be us'd concerning *Moses*, they are obliged to own, that *Moses* can fill the greatest Encomium that ever the Holy Spirit gave of Jesus Christ: it being certain that the Scripture never spake more honourably of Jesus Christ than it does in this beginning of *St. John's* Gospel. But if they deny it, and say, that we cannot speak thus of *Moses*, they will find themselves oblig'd to own, that this Encomium contains a higher and nobler Sense than what they affix to the Words of the Evangelist.

C H A P. X.

A Continuation of the same Argument.

BUT the most considerable thing is, that if we examine all these Expressions in particular, we shall find that there is not one of 'em that can have the Sence which our Adversaries affix to it.

A Treatise concerning the

This Expression, *the beginning, or in the beginning*, when it is so general, always signifies the beginning of the World. Thus 'tis said, *Job. 8.* that the Devil was a Murderer from the beginning. Jesus Christ saith, in *St Matth. 19.* that He which made Men at the beginning, madethem Male and Female; and 'tis not doubted but the beginning of the World is meant there. In a word, all these Expressions, *from the beginning it was not so, Thou, Lord, hast from the beginning laid the Foundations of the Earth. Ye know him that is from the beginning. The Devil sinneth from the beginning*, and all such like are only understood of the beginning of all things. They would become unintelligible, if they had any other Sense; because the Natural Impression of the Terms shews it.

The *Word* taken simply for him that manifests the Counsel of God, is another Expression without any Example in Scripture. It is not to be found either in the Old or New Testament. The Prophets manifested the Counsel of God: *Moses* manifested it yet better than the Prophets: and the Apostles reveal'd it better than *Moses*. And yet we no where find that the Apostles are called the *Word*, no more than *Moses* and the Prophets.

The only Expression that our Adversaries could find which had any resemblance to this, is that in the Visions of the Prophet *Esaias*, where *John* the Baptist is call'd the Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness, prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait. But first, 'tis false that *John* the Baptist is call'd the Voice of Jesus Christ. The sacred Oracle does not say so: as may be seen in the Words of the Prophet, which are these, *Isa. 40. 1, 2, 3, 4.* Comfort ye, comfort ye my People, saith your God, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her Warfare is accomplished, that her

Iniquity is pardon'd. The Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness, Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make strait in the Desert a high Way for our God. Every Valley shall be exalted, and every Mountain and Hill shall be made low; and the rough Places made plain. The Glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all Flesh shall see it together; for the Mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. The Voice said, Cry. And I said, What shall I cry? All Flesh is Grass. &c.

It is very evident that in these Words, *The Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness, Prepare ye, &c.* must be understood the Verb *is*, or the Verb *is heard*, to find any Sense in the Expressions of the Prophet. And indeed it is so explained by the Evangelists, St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke. The first applyeth the Oracle of Esaias thus: *For, this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet Esaias, saying, The Voice of one crying in the Wilderness is, Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait.* The Second after this manner, which comes much to the same thing: *As it is written in the Prophets, Behold, I send my Messenger before thy Face, which shall prepare thy Way before thee. The Voice of one crying in the Wilderness is, prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait.* Lastly, St. Luke speaks of him thus: *And he came into all the Country about Jordan, preaching the Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins. As it is written in the Book of the Words of Esaias the Prophet, saying, the Voice of one crying in the Wilderness is, Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait, &c.*

He that is in the Wilderness is John the Baptist. He that preacheth in the Wilderness is John the Baptist, He that prepareth the way of the God by exhorting to Repentance is

John the Baptist. The Voice mention'd in this Oracle is the Voice of him that cryeth or preacheth in the Wilderness, and saith, *make strait the Ways of the Lord*. This Voice then is the Voice of *John* the Baptist. Indeed, either the Voice mention'd in the Oracle of the Prophet is taken for the Voice, properly so called, of *John* the Baptist, or 'tis taken for his Person. If it be taken for the Voice or the Preaching of *John* the Baptist, then the Example cited by our Adversaries in this respect is ill alledg'd. If it be taken for the Person of *John* the Baptist, how can the Sence of the Oracle stand, and what Nonsense will be attributed to the Holy Ghost? *The Person of John the Baptist signify'd by the Word Voice, is, Prepare ye the Way of the Lord, make his Paths strait.*

But, you'll say, St. *John* himself makes this Answer to the Jewish Doctors, when they come to ask him, *Who art thou? I am the Voice of one crying in the Wilderness, &c.* The Answer is easie. Certainly the meaning is, I am that very Person whom the Prophet meant when he said, *The Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness is, Make plain the ways of the Lord, Make his Paths strait.* And we cannot otherwise reconcile the Evangelists, nor save them from manifest Contradiction.

It may be said, that this third Expression, *He was with God*, if taken in the Sense of our Adversaries, is also altogether without Example. For if it signifies, *He was known of God only*, where can we find an Instance of the like Expression? They cite a Passage of St. *John*, where it is said, *The Life was with the Father*, meaning, that it was known of the Father. But, first, 'tis false, that this Expression, *the Life was with the Father*, signifies, that it was known of the Father; or even that it was only known of the Father. For is it credible,

that
L. 1151

that St. *John* should say no more in this place of Eternal Life, than may be said of Sin, Eternal Death, the Devils, &c. who in this sence were with God from all Eternity, since they were from all Eternity known of God? Besides, there is a great deal of difference between speaking thus of a Quality, and using this Language of a Person. If we should say, *The Law was with God, and Moses was with God*, these two Expressions have a very different Sence.

This fourth Expression, *the Word was God*, is another Figurative Expression, if we will believe our Adversaries. But you'll find no Example of such a Figure. They pretend, that Jesus Christ is called *God*, because he is God's Representative. But tho' there have been several Persons since the Creation of the World, that have represented God, yet we do not find that any of 'em was called God, taking that Name in the singular number. It was said, *Ye are Gods*, in the plural number: but it was never said of any, that he was God. They will have him to be call'd God, because his Ministry was altogether Divine. It may be said of the Apostles, that their Ministry was all Divine, and especially if compar'd with the Ministry of the Prophets. They have revealed, as well as Jesus Christ, the blessed Immortality, and Life. They wrought the same Miracles that he did. So that if Jesus Christ might be called God for this reason; the Apostles might have pretended, as well as he, to the Glory of this Title. And yet we don't read that any Apostle is called God in the New Testament, but we find on the contrary, that they reject with abhorrence those that give 'em this Name. 'Twill perhaps be reply'd, that there is this Difference between Jesus Christ and the Apostles, the first is the Master

Master, whereas the others are only his Servants. But if the Apostles are Servants in respect of Jesus Christ, our Adversaries ought to own that Jesus Christ is a Servant in respect of God. If then not one of the Apostles could justly call himself the Lord, out of respect to Jesus Christ, because the Name of Lord was consecrated to him: it follows, that Jesus Christ could take the Name of God, because the Name of God was appropriated to the Supreme Being.

Neither can they shew us an Example of the Restriction with which they understand the Words, *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* For it appears, that the Holy Writer design'd to express himself as generally as he possibly could, seeing he is not content to say, *all things were made by him*; but he goes back again, and expresses the same thing more forcibly, by saying that *without him was not any thing made that was made.* It is said, that the subject Matter in hand limits this Expression: but this is asserted falsely. For, that which goes before, and what follows after, gives us a thought quite contrary to this, unless we renounce the natural Impression of the Terms. For the Evangelist expresses himself generally before and after the Words. He says before, *In the beginning was the Word.* Which is a general Expression, and induces us to believe that he speaks as generally when he says, *all things were made.* He says after, *the World was made by him.* This is another general Expression which teacheth us, that by *all things* we must truly understand all things without exception.

It will be as difficult for them to justify by Examples out of Scripture the new Explication

they give these Words, *the World was made* him. For whether they pretend to save themselves by explaining the Term *World* as they please, and understanding thereby the World to come, or whether they refine upon the manner in which they conceive the World was made by Jesus Christ, feigning that 'tis because this World was made ours by Jesus Christ; or whether, lastly, they seek for a new sence in this Expression, *he was made*: they will be still oblig'd to own, that they advance all this without any Proof, and without producing one instance of it taken out of the Holy Scripture. They cite Examples to shew that the *World* signifies sometimes the World to come: but these examples are ill cited. They pretend, for instance, that when the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* says, *When he bringeth in the first born into the World*, he saith, *let all the Angels of God Worship him*, we are to understand by the World, Eternal Life. First, the Phrase in the Original ought not to be render'd the *World*, but the *Earth*; for it is *την οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν*: and thus this Example is nothing to the purpose. Again, how can they prove that by this Earth, or this habital Earth spoken of by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, must be understood Heaven or Eternal Life, or the World to come.

The Second Example produc'd by 'em, is taken out of that Passage in the 2d. Chap. v. 5. of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: *For unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the World to come whereof we speak*. I leave our Adversaries to dispute, whether by this World to come, must be understood Heaven, or the State of the Blessed, or the Church, or the World renewed by the Gospel. For there is a vast difference between this

this general Expression *the World*, and this *World which is to come*: the first being in common, and not the second. And if, because Scripture speaks to us sometimes of a *World to come*, we understood the *World* to come every time that we meet with the Term *World*, we should make the Holy Ghost utter very great Extravagances.

It will be of no service to them for our Satisfaction in this respect, to cite the Words of the 10th Chap. of the Epistle to the Hebrews *Wherefore when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not, but a Body hast thou prepared me. Then said, I, Lo, I come to do thy Will, O, God!* 'Tis to no purpose to pretend to shew from these Words, that the Term *World* is sometimes taken for Heaven. Whether they take it of the first or the second coming of Jesus Christ into the World, 'tis always true that it must be understood of the *World* which we inhabit, and not of Heaven. For not only the *World* is not ordinarily taken for Heaven in Scripture, but it may be said, that these two Expressions are frequently oppos'd: as when Jesus Christ saith, *I came from my Father, and came into the World, and again, I leave the World, and go to my Father.*

But further, in what Sense was this *World* made by Jesus Christ? The Explication which our Adversaries give us of it is very particular. The *World*, that is to say, the *World to come* was made by Jesus Christ, because by him it was made ours; or, as they explain it still more particularly, because by Jesus Christ we have hope to obtain it, and shall obtain it effectually by him. But let them shew us an Example (not to say of an Apostle or Prophet, but) of a Man that explains himself after this manner.

But, say they, the Term *make* is taken there
renew; so that the sence of those Words is
This, The World was renewed by Jesus Christ. Here-
upon they quote abundance of Examples, but
the only one that appears to us any thing con-
siderable is that in in the 2d. Chap. of the Ep.
of St. Paul to the *Ephesians*, in these Words:
For we are his Workmanship, created in Jesus
Christ unto good Works. But this Example makes
nothing against us; because in this last passage,
the Term *created* is limited to a particular
sense, and to signifie *a renewing*, as appears from
his Expression, *unto good Works.* We also con-
fess, that if St. John had said, *The World was*
made or created by him in Righteousness unto good
Works, or to be a new Creature, this Passage must
have been understood in the Sense of our Ad-
versaries: but since it is not so, it is natural to
take this Expression in the Sense which the Im-
pression of the Terms immediately raises in our
Minds. For as, if St. Paul had said, *we are*
created by Jesus Christ, in the Passage above men-
tioned, he would have express'd himself so ob-
scurely and ambiguously, that we should never
have been able to penetrate his Thought, or we
should have attributed a Thought to him which
he never had: so, if St. John says, that *the*
World was made by Jesus Christ, after having said
and repeated that *all things were made by him,* and
if he says it only to shew that Jesus Christ
brought some alteration into the World by his
Gospel; he is not only obscure and impene-
trable in his Expressions, but we must be forc'd
to acknowledge, that his Discourse is not true,
or else we must renouncing judging of the
Words by their natural Impression.

In fine, 'twas never said of a Man that came
into the World, *This Man was made Flesh.* Such

an

an Expression is unsufferable. And yet, if we must believe our Adversaries, we are so to understand the Expression of St. *John*. *The Word was made Flesh*; that is to say, *Jesus Christ a mere Man, came into the World*. But what Instances are there of so wonderful a way of speaking? Do we say, *the King was made Flesh, the Emperor was made Flesh*? And did you ever find in the Sacred Writings, that any Prophet or Apostle was made Flesh? It is to no purpose to render these Words thus, *He was Flesh*. For this last Expression is yet more out of use in Humane and Divine Language.

It is then true, that all those Expressions which compose the beginning of the Gospel according to St. *John*, would be without Example, if they were to be taken in the Sense of the *Socinian* Gloss. But let us suppose it were not impossible to prove that every one of these Expressions were taken in Scripture once or twice in the Sense of our Adversaries, we must however own, that the uniting so many singular Forms of Speech were without Example, and would clash with Reason: And this the *Socinians* do not well consider. They are not sensible that one singular Expression may pass well enough in the Crowd of other clear and easie Expressions, by which it may be understood, and the Obscurity of the Discourse may be taken away. But a Man that should collect ten or a dozen of this singular Expressions, and should put 'em into a Discourse, would only make a Contexture of Nonsense and Extravagance. It were violent to suppose, that the general Term *Beginning* should be here taken against all use for the beginning of the Gospel. But when you have found an Example of the Explication you give it among a thousand Examples to the contrary, it does not therefore fol-

now, that in the place where this Term stands, you ought to deprive of its general Signification, which all the Circumstances of the Discourse prove to be the most natural ; but when you offer this violence to this first Expression, you cannot do so to nine or ten Expressions following, without thinking that the Holy Ghost united for the first time so many Expressions, which are all to be taken in a particular Sense, and out of their natural Use, that, I say, he only united 'em to lead us into Error. Our Adversaries find their Account in considering each Expression one after the other, because as they have abundance of Subtilty, 'tis not impossible for 'em, by great application of thought, to imagine some Senses that come pretty near those which they affix to the Words of the Scripture. But when they are obliged to re-unite all their Designs and Explications, they make an unheard of, absurd and most extravagant Collection.

Neither will it do 'em any Service to imagine strongly how to make us doubt of the Gospel according to St. *John*, or to render the beginning of it suspected as supposititious. For to stop the flight of an Imagination that only seeks for matter of doubt in this respect, I have no more to say, but that the beginning of the Gospel according to St. *John* being Synonymous with all those Passages of Scripture, which assert the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ, as are these that say, that *Christ being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, made himself of no Reputation, &c.* That the *Worlds were made by him* ; That he *created things visible and invisible* ; That he *laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and that the *Heavens are the work of his Hands* ; That *all things*
are

are by him and for him, &c. That, I say, the beginning of the Gospel according to St. *John*, being perfectly Synonymous with all these Expressions which are scatter'd throughout the New Testament, these Fictions and Doubts concerning the supposition of the Text, which were otherwise only founded on the good Pleasure of those that find them convenient for their Opinion, become altogether unprofitable, and thereupon very unreasonable.

Neither will it be any great Advantage to them to philosophize upon the manner how the Writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles are the Word of God. For whether it be by Inspiration, or whether it be by the way of Direction, that God guided the Tongue or Pen of those Teachers, it is not to be believed that they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, and that they receiv'd miraculous Tongues on the Day of Pentecost, only to talk as they do, in case Jesus Christ is but a mere Creature. And though the Apostles were not in any wise inspired or guided by the Holy Ghost, it sufficeth that they be good and honest Men, to take great care not to engage Men in Idolatry and Impiety, by uttering so manifest and palpable Blasphemies.

If it be said, that these are only Flourishes of Rhetorick, and Flights of Fancy; we are presently convinced of the contrary, by the general Reflexion that may be made upon the Character of those admirable Books, which is such, that from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*, there cannot be found one single Expression dropt from those Writers to the Prejudice of the Glory of God. You don't find there either an impious Metaphor, or an Hyperbole tending to Blasphemy, or any unbecoming Parallel of Man with God.

But

But their Expressions are always humble, modest, religious; and when other Authors can hardly write four Lines without doing wrong to the Glory of God, 'tis surprizing and wonderful that this long train of Holy Teachers do discover in all their Words and Ideas that respect which is due to the Supreme Being. Which is, as every one knows, one of the Characters of the Divinity of the Scriptures.

Neither can it be objected, with any greater Reason, that the Idea of the Word taken for the Son of God, who is God himself, being new and extraordinary, one is oblig'd to seek for singular and new Senses in this Passage. For, first, to suppose that this Idea is new and extraordinary, is of no manner of weight, since all the other Ideas which compose this Passage have nothing extraordinary or singular in 'em. Besides, they that have study'd the *Hypotheses* of the Ancient *Hebrews*, know very well that they took the Face of God, the Majesty of God, the Glory of God, and the Word of God, for one and the same thing; and that the *Chaldee* Paraphrase takes these Terms for Synonymous Expressions. It is very well known, that the Paraphrase of Rabbi *Jonathan* renders these Words, *The Lord said unto my Lord*, by these, *The Lord said unto his Word*. In short, 'tis very plain that these Words which begin the Gospel according to St. *John*, *In the beginning was the Word*, do include in 'em a manifest allusion to the beginning of *Genesis*: there being this difference between this Evangelist and the others, that the others writing the History of Jesus Christ, begin it with his Manifestation in the Flesh, and with the very first Moments of his Humane Nature; whereas this Evangelist begins with the first Works of the Son of God, giving us to under-

stand that Jesus Christ, is the first Cause by which all things were made in the Creation of the World, and that before this Creation he was with God. He hints to us two things. First, That this Word by which God created the World, was not a meer Sound as the Word of Man, but that it was a Divine Person; or, if you please, a Person that existed with God, and that was God; and he expressly tells us, that this Person is Jesus Christ. But it is certain, that the first of these two Ideas now before us, was not in any wise unknown to the *Hebrews*. For the *Hebrews* that liv'd in the time of the Apostles, knew that the *Word spoken of by Moses, was the Image of the Supreme God, and Man the Image of the Word*. They called this Word, *the Son of God, his first-begotten Son*. They said, that he who cannot raise himself to the Thoughts of God, ought to ascend so far at least, as the Thoughts of *his Image, the most Sacred Word*. They call'd this Word, *The Original of the Creatures, the Word of God, and the Image or Model upon which Man was made*. And *Plato*, who, every one knows, was instructed in the School of *Moses*, whether he drew his Doctrine immediately out of the Books of the *Hebrews*, or whether he learnt it of *Pythagoras*, who took it from thence: Does not *Plato*, I say, exhort his Friends to swear by the Cause and Father of the Lord, calling him expressly, *the God of the Prince, the Father of the Lord*, and thereby understanding the Word.

Vide lib.
II. Euseb.
de Prep.
Evangel.

This Consideration is enough to satisfy us upon the Doubt which those start, who designing to render the beginning of *St. John's Gospel* suspected, pretend that these Ideas have something new and extraordinary in them, and have more resemblance with the Speculations of the *Gnosticks*, than with the other Doctrines of Faith. For we have

have already gain'd this Point upon 'em, that these Ideas are not so new and so strange as they imagin'd 'em. But besides, how little reason is there in this Doubt? They will have it to be *Cerintus* that compos'd the Gospel according to St. *John*, and the *Revelation*, or at least this beginning of the Gospel about which we are now disputing. As for this beginning, 'tis not just to separate it from the rest, nor indeed from St. *John's* Epistles and his *Revelation*, where the Ideas of the Word, the Word of God, Jesus Christ, true God, do every where abound, as in the beginning of his Gospel. And as to the suspicion they have, that the Gospel and *Revelation* are *Cerintus's*, nothing can be more absurd. For neither *Cerintus* would think it adviseable to suppose Books under his Enemy's Name, nor would the Churches of *Asia* receive the Visits of *Cerintus* for the Gospel of St. *John*. And then, what resemblance is there between St. *John* and the Doctrine of that Heretick, who believ'd that the Angels created the World; that a bad Angel gave the Law; and that Jesus Christ was the true Son of *Moses*; who affirm'd, that Jesus Christ was a Man, and Christ the Power of God, his Spirit, that came upon Jesus at his Baptism, and return'd to Heaven at his Death; that Jesus Christ suffer'd the Inconveniences of Life, and the Effects of Persecution, but that *Christ* wrought those great Miracles which are describ'd in the Gospel, &c. That Christ was impassible, though *Jesus* suffer'd; and that Christ fell upon the Apostles, &c. that one of the Angels created the World, gave the Law to the *Israelites*; say nothing of the Crimes he authoriz'd, nor the extravagant Subordination of *Aeonians*, which was common to him with other *Gnosticks*; which yet are such Doctrines, as have not the

least Countenance in St. *John's* Gospel. To what purpose then are those unnatural Doubts and restless Enquiries of a tormented Mind? If the Gospel according to St. *John* was composed by a *Gnostic*, because it establishes the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ, we must by the same reason take the whole Scripture for the Work of the *Gnostics*, since it all agrees to make us understand this great Principle.

And here it would be proper to encounter the *Arrians*, by shewing that the Words of St. *John* do as much overthrow their Hypothesis as the Hypothesis of the *Socinians*. But the Subject very well deserves a Chapter by it self.

C H A P. XI.

That there is no better Defence against the Evidence of these Proofs, in following the System of the Arrians.

THEY that have but a superficial Idea of things, will find more probability in the System of the *Arrians* than in the *Socinian* Hypothesis; because the former do at least preserve intire the Pre-existence of the Lord Jesus, which is a Doctrine so expressly mention'd in the New Testament: And, I confess, were we to stop here, the thing would be uncontestable. But when we come to consider this Subject a little nearer, we are forc'd to alter our Judgment: and we find that *Socinus* was much more judicious in his System than *Arrius*, it being engag'd from three Capital Difficulties, that are found in the System of those ancient Enemies of the Divinity of our Lord.

To understand the *First*, we must forthwith suppose, that as the Name of God is necessarily either a Name of Office, or of Nature, that is to say, a Name that imports external Trusts and Qualities, or that imports Excellency, and Essential Perfections; the *Arrians* cannot defend themselves, when they are urged with the consideration of the Name of God given to Jesus Christ, by saying, that 'tis a Name of Office, and that Jesus Christ only bears it as an Ambassador of the most High God: which is the evasion of the *Socinians*. For, as they own that Jesus Christ was before his Incarnation, they are forced to acknowledge that he was God from the time that he was before the Creation of all things. For the Passages of Scripture which they explain of his Pre-existence, are very express herein. *In the beginning was the Word: it was with God: it was God.* Now if they grant that when the Word was with God, that in the beginning when all things were not yet made by him, *this Word was God*: they ought also to acknowledge that he was the *true God, in the form of God, the mighty God, the great God, God blessed for evermore*, which are the Names that the Scripture gives him elsewhere. For we don't see that there's any more reason to affirm one, than to acknowledge the other. And if so, I ask how the Names and Praises that are most appropriate to the most High God can belong to Jesus Christ in this first Estate, wherein it cannot be said that he either represented God, or acted in his Name, or was his Ambassador to Men? What if Jesus Christ were a created Spirit, as Noble and as Excellent as you would have him: do we express the Essence and Perfections of a Creature by the Name of God? Do we say of a Creature, that it is in the form of God,

and equal with God? Though this Spirit had a Divine Glory in respect of us, can we attribute a Divine Glory to him, when we conceive him as being with God? and especially can we give him the Name of that great God, who is infinitely more exalted above his Spirit, than this Spirit is exalted above the smallest Atom of Dust? Certainly, instead of saying that he was in the form of God before he humbled himself, we must acknowledge that he was always in the form of a Servant, in the form of a Creature, and much more in Heaven than upon Earth, much more before the Creation of the World, than since he conversed amongst us in the Fulness of Time. For with what Perfections soever a Being is enrich'd, it is much more in the form of a Servant when 'tis with God, than when it converses among Men. So that instead of letting us know, that in this first Estate wherein Jesus Christ was with his Father he was God, they should have told us that 'twas in this first Estate, that Jesus Christ was nothing; as we see that a great Lord, whose Grandure and Stateliness appears with Splendor when he is in his own Government, is nothing when he is at the Kings Court, whose Majesty eclipses that of his Servants. In a word, Jesus Christ considered in this first Estate wherein he is with God, bears the Name of God, either because he is God, or because he acts as God, or because he represents God. Not because he is God: for he is a Creature; and as excellent soever as this Creature can be, it could not without a Lye be describ'd by a Name consecrated to the Creator. Not because he acts as God: for we suppose Jesus Christ in a state wherein he does not act as yet at all; or if he does, 'tis only as a Minister of God: and consequently he ought not to have been describ'd

by

by a Name consecrated to the first Cause. And lastly, it is not because he represents God : for if he represented any Person that gave him the Power to bear his Name, it would be God. But Jesus Christ in this first Estate does not represent God. He does not represent him to the Angels, who have no need of a Representation in this Respect, because they see God Face to Face, that is to say, as much as is necessary for the plenitude of their Happiness, Glory and Holiness. And he does not represent him to Men, who as yet are not. Besides, must he, to represent God, bear the Name of God? The *Arrians* are upon this account in an inextricable Embarrassment, which becomes so much the greater, in that these lofty Titles of *true God, great God, mighty God, &c.* do here exalt the Name of God, which is given to Jesus Christ in several places of Scripture with those grand Epithets.

The *Second* Difficulty in the *Arrian* Hypothesis is this, that they cannot explain those Passages of Scripture which attribute to Jesus Christ the having made the Worlds, the having created Things visible and Things invisible, &c. the making all Things subsist by his powerful Word, the having laid the Foundation of the Earth, and created the Heavens, the having made the World; they cannot, I say, explain them without contradicting themselves, by acknowledging the Divinity, properly so called, of Jesus Christ, after they have deny'd it, or without being under a necessity of advancing extravagant Propositions. For as they understand all those Passages literally which assert that God made all things by Jesus Christ, and that *without him was not any thing made that was made* : they are oblig'd to attribute to Jesus Christ the creation of Heaven and Earth, and even of

Angels and Souls ; and then they must say one of these Two Things : Either that the Word made all things by his own Virtue and Power, as we see the Sun inlightens us by its own Force, which is its Light : or that the Word having no Power to produce these things ; or at least not displaying any, was but the mere Instrument by which the infinite Power of the Supreme God display'd it self ; as we see that the Apostles having no Power to do Miracles of themselves, were the Instrument by which the infinite Power of God wrought them. If the last be said, and Jesus Christ be but an Excellent Spirit, who by his Prayers and Intercessions, or otherwise, was an Instrument of the infinite Power of God in creating this World : We have Reason to complain of being seduced by the Words of the Scripture, which says expressly, that the World was made by him ; we find it incomprehensible, that he should be called the Power and Wisdom of God, seeing he is but a mere Instrument of this Power and Wisdom, by which they display themselves ; and we think it very abusive that (considering the care that the Apostles take to declare, that it is not by their own Power that they work the Miracles which the Jews admire) they do not take the same care to inform us that it is not by his own Efficacy and Power that the Word does *his* Works which are so Great and Noble ; but on the contrary declare, that 'tis the Name of *Jesus* that does all those Wonders, that 'tis Jesus Christ by whom and for whom all things are, and that he upholds 'em by the Power of his Word ; that he laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. which are very extravagant Expressions, if it be true that Jesus Christ contributed no more to the Production

of the Universe than the Apostles did to the Miracles that appear'd to be wrought by their Ministry. But if the first be said, viz. that Jesus Christ, the Eternal Word, made the Creatures by his own Efficacy and Power, but by such a Power and Efficacy as emanated first from the Supreme Being, which was the Opinion of the Old *Arrians*, who also attributed to the Father to concern himself in nothing, but to have left all management to the Son, the noblest and most perfect of his Creatures, who was alone created immediately by him: in this case it must be granted, that the Father did communicate to the Son the Power of Creating. But the Power of Creating is an infinite Power, seeing it surmounts the infinite Distance which is between *being and nothing*; and 'tis beyond all dispute that an infinite power is an infinite Perfection, and that an infinite Perfection can never be communicated to a Creature, because 'twould be Finite, and 'twould not be Finite. Further, if Jesus Christ, being a mere Creature, did create all things, it was either as an *Instrumental Cause*, or as a *Principal Cause*. It was not as an *Instrumental Cause*: for there is never any Instrumental Cause, but when there is an Object upon which this Instrument can act, and to which it ought to be in some measure proportion'd. But here there is no Object to act upon, because all things are taken out of the Bosom of nothing. If it is as a *Principal Cause*, it follows, that he is a Creator, that he has an infinite Power, and that he ought not to be distinguish'd from the Supreme Being in respect of his Perfections. For if he be invested with infinite Power, why should he not also be invested with infinite Wisdom, &c. and so with the other Attributes of the Deity? In short, either Jesus Christ acted alone in the
Crea-

Creation and Preservation of all things, or he acted together with his Father. If he acted alone, how comes the Scripture to make him say, that the Father worketh with him, and not a Hair of our Head falleth to the Ground without our Father which is in Heaven? If he acted together with the Father, either he displays the same Power that the Father does, or a different Power. If he displays the same Power, he displays an infinite Power, for the Father displays an infinite Power. If he displays a different Power, wherein was this last Power necessary, since the first was already sufficient, and God acted upon nothing by his mere Will?

The *Third* Difficulty which we find in the *Arrian* Hypothesis is this, that 'tis impossible to defend *Moses*, the Patriarchs and the Prophets from manifest Idolatry, when they worshipt as the Supreme God the Angel that appear'd to 'em so often, and that must be acknowledged for a mere Creature put in the place of God. Nor it can be said, with the *Socinians*, that this Angel was not worshipt for himself, but because he represented God; and that, when out of his Place and Ministry, he was not worthy of a greater Honour than others. For we are here told by St. *John*, that this Spirit, which he calls the Word, setting aside his Conversation with Men, from the beginning, before the Creation of things being with God, was God. Thus must we look upon all the Homages that this Spirit afterwards claims as Homages he demands, as being due to his own Perfections: and from thence it will follow, by very just Consequences, that we shall be oblig'd to apply to an Angel those Oracles which had for their Object the Supreme God. But we shall have Occasion to enlarge this Consideration afterwards.

C H A P. XII.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that the Language of the Holy Ghost is Obscure, Absurd, and not conformable to Godliness, if the Socinian Gloss were to be receiv'd.

AS to the Obscurity that would be found in Scripture, were we to expound it by the Principles of the *Socinians*, it is so plain and obvious, that 'tis needless to prove it, and therefore we will only examine into the Occasion of it. The Obscurity we meet with in some Passages of Scripture is reducible to several general Principles.

First, It arises from the Nature of the Things which the Scripture propounds to us. To this Principle we may reduce the Difficulties which we meet with in those Passages of Scripture that respect the Nature of God, the Mystery of the Incarnation, the Degrees of Election and Reprobation, the Eternity of Torments which await the Wicked after this Life, the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and all those other Great and Sublime Mysteries that cannot be well apprehended by the Understanding of Man, except they cease to be what they are, or he cease to be what he is. We cannot reduce to this Principle the Obscurity which our Adversaries meet with, by their own Confession, in the Passages abovemention'd. 'Tis no great Mystery for a Creature to reveal the Counsel of God; to live in the beginning of the Gospel, or in the time of *John* the Baptist; to be known of God alone; to be appointed to a more glorious Ministry than the Ministry of the Prophets; for a mere Man to be made Flesh, that is to say,

say, partaker of a Corporal Nature. It is no extraordinary matter to say, that Jesus Christ was in appointment before *Abraham*, or that he possess a Glory with his Father, because it was determined at that time in God's Decree that he should possess it.

The *Second Cause* of the Obscurity which we meet with in some Passages of Scripture, proceeds from the Impossibility which Sin, that has infected all the Faculties of our Souls, puts us under, of judging a-right of those Objects which are presented to our Understanding. *If our Gospel is hid*, saith St. Paul, *'tis hid to those that are lost, whose mind the God of this World hath blinded.* It were needless to produce Examples of so notorious a Truth: but however, we may do well to descend into our selves, and see whether the Obscurity which we meet with in the *aforesaid Passages* springs from the Corruption of our Heart. Indeed it might be very well suspected, if 'twere we that found 'em obscure: but as 'tis chiefly our Adversaries, they ought to acknowledge the Obscurity. For in *our Sense* the Object is Sublime, but the Expression easie: but in their Sense the Object is very well proportioned to our Capacity, but the Expression is obscure. Farther, can it be said, without Extravagance, that 'tis we, and not our Adversaries, who yield to a secret Desire of turning these Passages advantageously to our own Opinion; and that the Passions of our Heart force us to invent such new and extraordinary Senses? Pray, what irregularity is there in imagining that this Expression, *in the beginning*, is a general Expression; that this, *the Word was God*, includes something greater than the Glory of a mere Minister; that these Words, *By him all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made*, signifie some-

somewhat else besides the preaching of the Gospel ; and that these, *Before Abraham was I am*, carry in 'em somewhat else besides a Commendation that agrees to the meanest of Creatures, &c.

We may reckon for a third Cause of the Obscurities we meet with in Scripture, the Genius of the Original Tongues of the Old and New Testament, which is sometimes very little agreeable to ours. But it is granted, that this is not the Source of the Obscurity we meet with in the controverted Passages between our Adversaries and us. It is not the Genius of the Language of those Writers, that would have us invest a Creature with the most glorious Characters of the Glory of the Creator. On the contrary, the Holy Language is quite opposite to this Character. Other Languages indeed have something impious and Heathenish in 'em. They don't scruple to use the Terms, *Adorable, Divine, Incense, Sacrifice, Eternity, Supreme Good*, even when they are speaking of the Creatures. But the Language of the Sacred Authors, as being consecrated to express the Heavenly Revelation, is sober and Religious. 'Tis true, they use *Hyperboles* sometimes, but never such as can prejudice the Glory of God.

The Scripture is obscure in the fourth place, when it mentions Events that are yet in the Womb of Futurity. An excessive Perspicuity in Prophecy would destroy the Accomplishment of it. No body wonders, for instance, that in the Vision of the Prophet *Ezekiel*, things are involv'd in Enigmatical and Parabolical Figures, fit to render the Discourse more obscure ; because they are the Secrets of Futurity. But the Expressions now before us contain no manner of Prophecy : For they signifie, almost all of them,

them, the time past. I am before *Abraham* was. *The Word was in the beginning. It was with God. It was God.*

A fifth Source of the Obscurity we meet with in some Passages of Scripture, is Philosophy. Certain it is, that there are a great many Passages in the Old and New Testament, which being clear in themselves, are made obscure by the Commentaries of Philosophers and Scholastick Divines. There can be nothing said like this concerning the Passages controverted between us and our Adversaries. For the Question is not about the Obscurity that is in these Passages as explain'd according to our Sentiments; but the Question is concerning the Obscurity that is found in 'em, as explain'd after the manner of our Adversaries. The Sentiment of the *Socinians* is, as they pretend, extremely disengag'd from the Subtilties of the Schools. But yet 'tis in their Sentiment that these Passages are extremely difficult and obscure.

This then is an Obscurity that has none of those Causes which are ordinary to the Obscurity of difficult Passages in Scripture: Which is very surprizing; but 'twill appear much more so, if we consider, that this Obscurity having not its Cause in us, and being not reasonably to be ascribed to us, it must be attributed to God. But if God is the only Cause, 'tis a Riddle that he propounds to us, but such a Riddle as we cannot comprehend the End of it.

His Design cannot be to glorifie himself. For, pray, wherein can an Obscurity of Scripture, which leaves us to believe that Jesus Christ is God, that he created the World, the Worlds, &c. and that, in short, he was invested with the most peculiar Glory of the Supreme Being; wherein, I say, can such an Obscurity glorifie God?

His

His Design cannot be to illuminate Men. For, how could an Obscurity illuminate the Mind of Man? Besides, why must they be illuminated by exposing them to the danger of so mortal an Error?

It cannot be said, that God design'd hereby to try Mens Faith. For though the greatness of the Objects propounded to us in Scripture, together with that contrariety which these Objects have to our ordinary Prejudices, do serve to exercise our Faith; we do not see how obscure and extraordinary Expressions, which might be made use of to represent those Objects, could promote this Design. Nay, further, though the Holy Ghost should design to exercise our Faith, he would never do it at the Expence of God's Glory and our eternal Salvation, by giving us such Ideas as would naturally tend to betray us into Idolatry. In a Word, if this was the Design of the Holy Ghost, he had been mightily mistaken in his Aim; for, at farthest, he had only exercis'd the Faith of a very small number of Persons, seeing there are but very few, who in these last times are inclin'd to understand these Words in the Sense which is supposed to be the truest.

The second Principle which we have hereupon establish'd is, that the Hypothesis of our Adversaries renders the Language of the Scripture false and deceitful.

Indeed, the Falsity of a Discourse consists in this, that the Signification affix'd to it by Custom, is not found to be true; and not that the Signification which we affix to it either mentally, or from a particular Fancy, is found contrary to the Truth. For is it not true, that Equivocations and Mental Reservations include in them real Lyes, though, in the Sense of those

those that make them, they may be real Truths.

I affirm, secondly, that the Sentiment of our Adversaries renders the Language of Scripture perfectly deceitful. Which is easily prov'd, by shewing, that if it be lawful to give the Scripture a Sence that is remote from the ordinary Signification of the Terms, there is no Doctrine so monstrous as cannot be easily establish'd by the Scripture.

It were easie for me (for instance,) if I had a mind, to maintain, that the Supreme God had no hand either in the Work of Creation, or in the Work of Redemption, and also that there is not once mention made of it in the ancient Oracles; and I could defend my Sentiment, without offering more violence to the Scripture of the Old Testament, than our Adversaries do to the New.

For I would maintain, that He who made the Heavens and the Earth, was an Angel, the Minister of the Supreme God, who was not God by Nature, but merely by Office. If you objected to me the Names given him in Scripture: I would say, what the *Socinians* say in this Case of Jesus Christ, viz. that he bears them only as he is the Ambassador and Minister of the most High God. I should make no great account of the Epithet of *Almighty*, which is sometimes given him. I should say, that this Angel does all things in this lower World by the Will of the most High God, who has resign'd to him the Administration of it; but that there are other Worlds *ad infinitum*, which do not at all depend upon his Empire. If you objected to me, that he is called the *Searcher of Hearts*, I should say, that he is only so, because the most High God reveals to him every thing that passes in the Soul. If

you

you objected to me, that he is said to have created all things : I might answer, that by all things, must not be understood all things without Exception, but only such as respect us, or belong to this visible World. If you objected the Worship that is paid him, and you pretended that this was an Homage peculiar to the Supreme God : We might distinguish between a Supreme Worship, and a Subordinate Worship. If it were objected, that this Dependency of the Angel, called God, upon the Supreme God, appears no where in Scripture : It were very easie to produce several Examples to the contrary : as this, *The Lord rained Fire from the Lord* ; those Words to *Abraham*, spoken by him who is called by the Name of God, *But now I know that thou fearest the Lord* : And when the God of *Israel* is called, *The Greatest among the Gods*, might we not understand that he is the Greatest among the Angels, to whom the Supreme God has committed the Government of several Parts of the Universe ? Which would certainly suppose, that the God of *Israel* was not the Supreme God. It were in vain to object, that the God of *Israel* is He that created the Heaven and the Earth ; and that the Action of creating supposes an infinite Power, which cannot belong to any but the most High God : For in case of need, our Adversaries would furnish us themselves with an Answer to this Difficulty, by shewing us, that the Term *אֱלֹהִים* does not always signifie to take out of nothing, but merely to produce, and sometimes to fashion, to dispose. But if it were objected, that the God of *Israel*, in saying, that he will not give his Glory to another, speaks as being the Supreme God, because it belongs only to the Supreme God to have a peculiar and incommunicable Glory : It might be answer'd,

R

that

that the Angel of God who has received the Government of this Universe, has a Glory peculiar to himself, in having received this Empire exclusively of other Intelligences; and that he possesses particularly this Glory, in opposition to Idols, which are but Vanity. It might be further suppos'd, if we would, that the Supreme God has left him the power of communicating to another so much of his Empire as he pleas'd; and therefore he could communicate it to Jesus Christ, in whom he has put his Name, as the Supreme God did to him. I leave our Adversaries to judge, whether it were easie for them to force us in these Intrenchments which they themselves have made us by their own *Hypotheses*; and to think of what Consequence it therefore is, never to deprive the Words of Scripture of their natural Force and Signification; seeing if we once give our selves the Liberty of affixing new Senses to the Terms, *God, Adore, &c.* there remains no manner of certainty either in Scripture, or the Analogy of Faith; which is no more than a perpetual *Pyrrhonism*.

As God is the God of Truth, it cannot be suppos'd, without impious Confidence, that he ever design'd to betray us into Error, by speaking to us in a false and deceitful Language. But if this Procedure ought to be lookt upon as being contrary to his Eternal Truth, it is contrary to his infinite Wisdom, and the Dignity of his Revelation, to speak to us in a Language full of Absurdity, and Extravagance, as it appears the Language of the Scripture would have been, if the Hypothesis of our Adversaries were True.

Is there any thing, for instance, more ridiculous than this Expression, *He was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh*, if, as our Adversaries

Adversaries pretend, Jesus Christ is but a mere Man, honour'd with the Title of God upon the account of his Ministry? For what Sense must we give this Term *Flesh*? If you take it as 'tis oppos'd to *Spirit*, 'twill follow, that the Sense of the Expression is this, *He was made of the Seed of David according to the Body, and not according to the Soul*. But this is to give the Expressions of Scripture a ridiculous Air, and to play the fool (if we may be allowed to say so) with the Holy Ghost, by attributing to him such Language. *Alexander* had a Body and a Soul: and yet we should have thought the Man ridiculous, that should have express'd himself after this manner, *Alexander was made of the Seed of Philip according to the Flesh*. Nay, this Expression would have been absurd in the Mouth of a Man that had believ'd *Alexander* to be the Son of *Jupiter*. For such a Man should have said expressly, that *Alexander* was not the Son of *Philip*; and not, that he was the Son of *Philip* according to the *Flesh*. Perhaps 'twill be said, that this Expression, *according to the Flesh*, is oppos'd, not to the Nature of Jesus Christ, but to his Heavenly Offices, and most Divine Ministry: the Sense being this, that Jesus Christ was made of the Seed of *David*, not as he is God, or as he is honour'd with a most Heavenly Ministry, but as he is a Man, or as he has a Corporal Nature. But St. *Peter* was likewise the Son of *Zebedee*, not as an Apostle, his Apostleship being a Divine Office, and coming immediately from God; but as a Man. And yet this Expression, *Peter was made of the Seed of Zebedee according to the Flesh*, would be ridiculous. Perhaps 'twill be reply'd, that this way of speaking, *He was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh*, imports, that Jesus Christ has a nobler Principle

A Treatise concerning the

than the ordinary Principles of the Generation of other Men, having been conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost. For, first, 'tis evident that in this place is not meant the Principle that made Jesus Christ, but the matter of which Jesus Christ was made. *He was made according to the Flesh.* Secondly, 'tis certain from Scripture and the Analogy of Faith, that Jesus Christ was made of the Seed of David, and made Flesh by the Power of the Holy Ghost. And so this Expression, *He was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh,* is pretty near equivalent to this in the Sense of the Scripture, *He was made of the Seed of David according to the Flesh, by the Holy Ghost.* And if so, we are still to know what we must understand by *He was made according to the Flesh.* For if Jesus Christ is but a mere Man by Nature, this Expression, *according to the Flesh,* is perfectly ridiculous.

Among these must be plac'd that Celebrated Passage in St. John's Gospel: *And now, O Father, glorifie thy Son with the Glory which he had with thee before the World was.* If you expound it of the Glory which Jesus Christ had in the Divine Decree, you say nothing but what is in it self reasonable; for it is true, that the Glory of Jesus Christ's Exaltation was in the Counsel of God before it was in the Nature of things: but 'tis also certain, that the Expression will be very absurd, being out of common use; except you think it rational for a Man to say to God: *Lord, give me the Health which I had with thee before the World was. Lord, feed me with my ordinary Bread with which I was fed with thee before all Ages. Lord, grant that I may safely arrive in that place where I was with thee before the Foundation of the World.*

And it is as easie to shew that the Hypothesis of our Adversaries renders the Language of the Scripture impious and full of Blasphemy. The thing speaks of it self. This Impiety, supposing that the Sentiment of our Adversaries were true, would have six Degrees. The *First* consists in this, that the sacred Writers take no manner of care to avoid such Expressions as may give occasion to Blasphemy. Such are those Expressions of God, *equal with God, Worship, the Creator of all Things, &c.* which were never us'd but to express the Glory of the Supreme God. The *Second* consists in this, that Jesus Christ joins these Expressions with certain other ways of speaking which carry in 'em an excessive and criminal Familiarity with the Supreme God, if it be true that he is not of one and the same Essence with him. Such is the Title he takes of *Son, own Son, and only Son of God*, calling God his Father, not by the bye, upon one or two occasions only, and so, as to let us know that he pretends to it only by a Figure; but ordinarily in Grave and Serious Discourses, without any restriction or limitation, saying, *my Father*, when others say, *my God*; and shewing that he assumes this remarkable Title in a proper and literal Sense. The *Third* Degree of this Impiety consists in daring to put the Creature in parallel with the Creator by such horrible Expressions as these are, if the Sentiment of our Adversaries were reasonable: *He thought it no robbery to be equal with God. Philip, who sees me, hath seen the Father*: as if he that sees the brightness of a Glow-worm had thereby seen the Lustre of the Sun, or the Glory of the Firmament with all its Luminaries; and these: *Go and Baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: as if we should say, *Go*

and enroll the People by the Order of the King and his Slave. The *Fourth* consists in this, that when the Scripture expresses the Honour and Homage due to Jesus Christ, it makes use of the general Term *Worship*, without ever giving us notice that it means a Subordinate Worship; though there be as great a Difference between Supreme and Subordinate Worship, as there is between the Creator and the Creature, and tho' it be most certain, that if any one should use himself to give the Title of Majesty to any other but the King, he would be guilty of Irreverence towards the King's Person, tho' he might mentally distinguish between Supreme and Subordinate Majesty; because Terms have their Signification from Custom, and not from the particular Fancy of the Person that uses them. The *Fifth* Degree of Impiety that we find in the Style of the Scripture, supposing the Sentiment of our Adversaries to be true, consists in this, that it invests a Creature with the Qualities and Works of the Creator. And *Lastly*, that the Apostles apply to Jesus Christ the Oracles of the Old Testament, which express in the most forcible and emphatical manner the Glory of the most High God. But this Argument shall be the Subject of the following Section.

S E C T.

S E C T. IV.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ is not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, there is no manner of Harmony between the Prophets and the Apostles, or between the Old and New Testament.

C H A P. I.

That, if Jesus Christ is not of One and the Same Essence with his Father, the Prophets who spoke of him, did not foresee Things as they were to come to pass.

AS the Religion of Jesus Christ depends on a double Testimony, viz. of the Prophets, and of the Apostles; it is necessary for the Confirmation of our Faith, that these two Testimonies should unite and support one another.

From hence it follows, that an Hypothesis which destroys this Agreement that should be between the Evangelists and the Prophets, overthrows the real Foundations of Religion.

But the Sentiment of those that make Jesus Christ to be a mere Creature, is exactly of this Character; since if you suppose this Sentiment to be true, you must be forc'd to own, first, that the Spirit which inspir'd the Prophets did neither foretell nor foresee things as they were to come pass under the new Dispensation; and secondly, that the Spirit by which the Apostles spoke, did not understand the Oracles of the Old Testament.

The *First* will be granted, if we consider,
I. In what manner the Prophets describe the True God.

II. How they describe the Messias.

III. Upon what Fundamental Maxims they establish the Jewish Religion.

IV. and Lastly, with what Circumstances they describe the Establishment of the New Covenant and the Calling of the Gentiles.

The Prophets describe the Great and Supreme God by such Titles as they give him exclusively to all other Beings: and 'tis upon this Account that they call him the Creator of all things. *Tis he that formeth the Light, and createth Darknes, &c.* The First and the Last. *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, I am the First, I also am the Last.* The King of Glory. *Lift up your Heads, ye everlasting Doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.* Sometimes the Searcher of Hearts. *Thou, Lord, alone knowest the Heart, &c.* Sometimes the Saviour or Redeemer. *I, even I am he, that blotteth out thy Transgressions for my own sake, &c.* Thus with the Redeemer of Israel, &c. I will place Salvation in Zion for Israel my Glory, &c. Sometimes the Judge, Law-giver and King. *For the Lord is our Judge, The Lord is our Law-giver, The Lord is our King, He will save us.* And sometimes the Most High. *Thou alone art the Most High over all the Earth.*

Esa. 48.

Esa. 43.

Esa. 46.

Esa. 33.

Mal. 83.

It is remarkable, that these are not only the Characters of the Supreme God, but also his peculiar Characters. For it is said, that he alone is the most High God; that he alone knoweth the Hearts of Men; that he, and none else, blotteth out Transgressions for his own sake, &c. that he is the Saviour, the Redeemer of Israel, and that there is none else.

We ought also to consider, that these Characters are such as principally distinguish the Creator from the Creature; and that 'twould be very difficult to meet with others in Scripture, whereby this difference might appear with greater Clearness. For we may be very well assur'd of it, in that these are the Titles God makes choice of, when he designs to distinguish himself from other Beings.

And yet these Titles are all given to Jesus Christ in the New Testament. He is acknowledg'd for *Him that laid the Foundation of the Earth, the Heavens being the Work of his Hands.* He is call'd *the First and the Last, He that searcheth the heart and tryeth the reins.* And Zachary says of Jesus Christ's Forerunner, that *he should go before the face of the most High.* Jesus Christ is call'd *the King of Kings, the Lord of Glory.* For, *had they known him, they would never have crucifi'd the Lord of Glory.* *He is our King, our Judge, and the Saviour of the World.* This is notorious.

If these Titles belong to Jesus Christ, as we cannot in the least doubt of it, whence comes it that the Prophets give 'em to the Supreme God, as being peculiar to him, and incommunicable to all Others? Whence comes it that they did not foresee that these Titles would be given to a mere Creature, which, how Excellent soever it can possibly be, is infinitely below that Eternal and Infinite Being? How is it possible, that in all

all these noble Descriptions which the Old Testament gives us concerning the Deity, we only meet with Equivocal Passages, that were to be long as well to Jesus Christ as to his Father? And when the Holy Ghost tells us so frequently, that God, the Great God, the Supreme God alone possesses these Titles; and that they belong to no other besides him: what can we think else, but that either the Holy Ghost did not foresee the Glory of Jesus Christ, who was to bear all these Qualities, or that if he did foresee it, he had a design to betray us into an Error which confounds the Creator with the Creature?

We shall be confirm'd in this Thought, if we add to the consideration of God's Characters, that of the Characters of the Messiah. If the Spirit that inspired the Prophets did not foresee what would come to pass after the coming of the Messiah, what the Impressions of his Doctrine would be, and how it would be condemn'd of Blasphemy and Impiety by the Jews, accusing Jesus Christ of making himself equal with God; and how afterwards the Disciples of the Messiah would make their Master the Object of their Worship; and after that, for several Ages, the Object of their Idolatry: It is impossible to conceive, that this Spirit should be the Spirit of him that knoweth all things. And if this Spirit did foresee what would happen in this respect, it is extremely difficult not to be offended, when we find that this Spirit, instead of preventing the Idolatry he foresaw, does all he can to give birth and countenance to it. For what other Design could he have in calling the Messiah, *God with us, the Lord our Righteousness, the God and Saviour of the whole Earth, the Father of Eternity, the mighty God, the Lord that is to come into his Holy Temple?*

Here,

Here, perhaps, it will be said, that though the Messiah be called *God with us*, or *God our Righteousness*, yet he is not called downright God; and that these two Expressions only signify, that by the Messiah God would be with Men, by giving them some Marks of his Favour; and that by the Messiah also God would justify them, and become the Author of their Salvation. It is to no purpose to enter upon this Enquiry, since we quote other plain and express Passages out of the Old Testament, wherein the Messiah is called *God*, *the God and Saviour of the whole Earth*, *the mighty God*, *the Lord that is to come into his Holy Temple*.

Besides, this Answer does not at all affect our Argument. For we don't here argue from the force of the Expressions, but from the Wisdom or the Design of the Holy Ghost that us'd them. Certainly tho' it were not the Spirit of God, but a Man of indifferent Prudence, that acted on this occasion, we cannot imagine that if he foresaw that Men would one Day fall into so dismal an Idolatry as to confound Jesus Christ with the Supreme God, would ever think of describing Jesus Christ by these great Names, *God with us*, *the Lord our Righteousness*, *our God and Saviour*, *the mighty God*, &c. And if our Adversaries could put themselves in the place of the Prophets, and were by God's Order to form an anticipated Model of the Christian Religion, they would take special care not to describe the Messiah to come in this manner.

Here perhaps it will be said, that 'tis not very surprizing that the Prophets should speak thus of a Man to whom they knew God was to communicate his Name and Glory. For if that be the Design of the Prophets, or of the Spirit that inspir'd them, 'tis inconceivable that they should

should take all these Principles for the Fundamental Maxims of their Religion. *The Gods that made not the Heavens shall be rooted from the Earth, and from under the Heavens. I will not give my Glory to another. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. He that sweareth on the Earth, shall swear by the God of Truth.* For here is a Prophecy and a Precept all together; and we may venture to say, that never was one Man more contrary to another, than the Holy Ghost would be to himself on this Occasion.

Which will be much better agreed to, if we consider after what manner the Prophets circumstantiate the Calling of the Gentiles with the Establishment of the New Covenant by Jesus Christ. It is described to us in the ancient Oracles by Four remarkable Characters. The First is, an Universal Joy and Gladness. *The Nations shall rejoice, and triumph with Gladness. God shall create Jerusalem a Rejoicing. Rejoice, O Heavens, and break forth into Singing, O Earth.* And as if insensible Creatures were suddenly to be capable of Sense, in order to share this great Salvation, the Prophets proclaim, that the Isles, the Sea, the Earth, the Mountains, the Forests, and the Desarts, ought to shout for Joy. The Second of these Characters is, God's Dwelling among Men. *Behold, the Lord will come with strong Hand, &c. For behold I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, &c. The Lord himself will come, and will save you; and then shall the Eyes of the blind be opened, &c.* The Third is God's Exaltation. *All things shall be abased, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that Day.* And the Fourth and Last, is the Destruction of Idols. *The Gods that made not, &c. I will deface all the Names of Idols from off the Earth.*

Esa. 40.
& 43.

If the Spirit by which the Prophets spake foresaw things as they were to happen, then it saw very well that it describ'd the calling of the Gentiles, and the Establishment of the Covenant by such Characters as were intirely false. It saw that the Gospel would cause the World to pass from one Idolatry to another more dangerous. For if we compare the Christian Idolatry, which makes an Idol of Jesus Christ and sets him on the Throne of the Supreme Being, with the Idolatry of the *Pagans* who worshipt false Gods, we shall find several Differences between the one and the other to the advantage of the last. The *Pagan* Idolatry was gross, and unworthy of understanding Persons; whereas the Christian Idolatry is Spiritual, and upon that account most dangerous. The former sprang from the abuse Men made of natural Revelation. The latter springs from the most natural Use we can make of written Revelation. For what more natural Use could we make of it, than to take its Expression in their ordinary and known Signification? The *Pagan* Idolatry is a mischief that the Holy Ghost has offer'd to prevent a thousand and a thousand times in the Old and New Testament, by giving us the most express Commands, and most forcible Exhortations upon this Occasion; whereas the Christian Idolatry is a mischief that the Holy Ghost neither foresaw, nor prevented, but seems rather to authorize by the most capable Expressions in the World (if we may say without Blasphemy) to betray Men to an impious Superstition. The *Pagan* Idolatry did not run so high as to equal the Subordinate Divinities to *Jupiter* their Supreme God. But if the Sentiment of our Adversaries is true, the Christian Idolatry consists in confounding Jesus Christ, who can be

be but a most Inferiour God, with the most High God. And though the *Pagans* worshipp'd several Gods, yet they did not believe these Gods to be infinite in Glory and Perfection; whereas the Christians believe it all of Jesus Christ. We may also add, that we think God's Jealousy would be sooner provok'd by investing a very excellent Creature with his Glory, than by transferring the Homages due to him, upon mean Creatures; because the former is much more dangerous than the latter, and consequently the Christian Idolatry should be more dangerous than the *Pagan*.

Certainly, either the Spirit that inspir'd the Prophets did not see things as they were, or else it foresaw that not only the New Covenant would not be signaliz'd by the Destruction of Idolatry, and that God would not deface all their Names, but rather that a less dangerous Idolatry would give place to a more criminal one, which would speedily overspread the Universe, that the desire of the Nations would become the Idol of the People, and that that Name which was given to Men that they might be sav'd, would be over the whole Earth, and for several Ages a Name of Blasphemy and Superstition.

From hence 'tis easie to conclude, that God has been so far from being exalted under the new Dispensation by the Abasement of all other things, that he was first abas'd himself by the Exaltation of Jesus Christ; in that this very Exaltation gave occasion to the Apostles to compare Jesus Christ with God, and to attribute boldly to him an equality with God, by investing him with all the Prerogatives and Titles of the Supreme Being.

From hence also it appears, that the Prophets had no great occasion to rejoyce at the Consequence

quences of the Gofpel, ſince by its moſt natural Impreſſions it would betray Men into Idolatry. And we muſt add further, that, if the Sentiment of our Adverſaries were true, God would be much leſs preſent in the Chriſtian Church, than in the Commonwealth of *Israel*; ſince he was preſent in the Ark and Cloud after a glorious Manner, and they will not allow any more than a mere Man in Jeſus Chriſt. Thus muſt we grant, that the Spirit which foretold, that God would come and dwell amongſt Men, was extremely miſtaken; and that, inſtead of giving this Abode of God amongſt Men as the Character of the New Covenant, he had ſpoken infinitely more truly, if he had ſaid, that in the time of the new Covenant God would manifeſt himſelf no more ſo preſent with Men as he had appear'd till that time.

Thus the Characters of the Supreme God deſcrib'd by the Prophets, and the Characters of the Meſſias foretold in the Old Teſtament, and the Fundamental Maxims upon which was eſtabliſht the Ancient and Rightful Worſhip of the True God, and the circumſtances which were to accompany the Eſtabliſhment of the New Covenant ſhew us, that either the Spirit which inſpir'd the Prophets did not foretel things in that manner they were to happen, or elſe that the things themſelves are not ſo as our Adverſaries would fain perſuade themſelves they are.

C H A P.

CHAP. II.

That if Jesus Christ is not of one and the same Essence with his Father, either the Apostles did not understand the Prophets, or they design'd to betray us into Error.

AS the Sentiment of those that take Jesus Christ for a mere Creature, would engage us to believe that the Errour lyes in the Predictions of the Prophets, it also puts us under a necessity of saying, that though the Apostles made the Old Testament the Foundation of their whole Doctrine, and the Holy Ghost which they receiv'd in so great a measure, should have given 'em the true Sense of it, yet, after all, they did not understand it. Indeed we cannot prove this at large, because we are not able to examine particularly every Passage of the Old Testament which the Apostles apply to Jesus Christ, in so small a Treatise as this is: But yet we cannot omit doing it in part, by examining some of those Passages which we judge most remarkable.

And there is none more remarkable than that Passage in the XL. Chap. of *Isaiab*, express'd in these Words, *The Voice cryeth in the Wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make strait in the Desert a high Way for our God.* *Zacharias*, filled with the Holy Ghost, and applying this Oracle to his Son *John*, cites and expounds it thus: *And thou, Child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Lord (or of the Highest :) for thou shalt go before the Face of the Lord to prepare his Ways, and to give Knowledge of Salvation unto his People, by the*
Remission

Remission of their Sins, &c. 'Tis plain, that in both these Orales, which are parallel to one another, all these terms, *the Lord, God, our God, the Sovereign, or the Higbest*, signifie the same Person. Certain it is, that if we consult the common Practise of the Sacred Writers, all these Names were never given to any but the Infinite Being, and the Supreme God. From whence it follows, that if all these Names belong truly to Jesus Christ, we must acknowledge Jesus Christ for the most High God, or the Supreme God, and consequently to be of one and the same Essence with his Father.

Now that all these Names belong properly to Jesus Christ, appears from their being all given him by the Holy Ghost. For he, before whose Face *John* the Baptist was to go, is Jesus Christ, as is prov'd by the Event, that Fore-runner saying in this Sense : *I Indeed baptize you with Water ; but he that cometh after me, the Latchet of whose Shoes I am not worthy to unloose, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.* But he, before whose Face *John* the Baptist was to go, is the very same that is called the Lord, our God, and the Higbest. *Thou shalt go before the Face of the Lord. Thou shalt be called the Prophet of the Higbest. Make strait in the Desert a high Way for our God.* Who then can doubt that Jesus Christ does not bear all these Titles ?

And indeed he, before whose Face *John* the Baptist was to walk, the Lord, whose Ways he was to make plain, is either God the Father, or our Saviour Jesus Christ. We see no other way, and it appears by the Answers of our Adversaries, that they see no other no more than wedo. But it is not God the Father before whose Face *John* the Baptist was to walk.

For either these Words, Thou shalt go before the Face of the Lord, are to be taken properly in such a manner that the Lord is to come properly unto Men, according to that Oracle, *God himself shall come, and shall save you; and then the Eyes, &c.* or these Expressions being Figurative, only signifie that God would visit Men in an extraordinary Manner, whether in his Justice, or in his Mercy; and that *John* the Baptist would prepare in the general the way to God's Grace and Mercy, by bringing them to Repentance. If the first be said, the Oracle cannot agree to God the Father, because *He* did not come properly unto Men. And if you insist on the second, it will follow, first, that *John* the Baptist did not walk before the Face of the Lord, but in the same Sense with *Noah*, who preach'd his Judgments before the Flood came, or with *Moses* who spake to *Pharaoh* to soften him, and to the People of *Israel* to persuade them to believe what was revealed to him, thereby preparing the Way to God's Mercy in the Redemption of *Israel*, and to his Justice in the Punishment of his People's Enemies. It follows, secondly, that 'tis not in *John* the Baptist, but in *Jesus Christ* himself, that *Zachary's* Oracle is chiefly accomplisht. For if the Benefits or the Judgments of God are to be taken from his Coming, God came chiefly, when he baptized the Apostles with the Holy Ghost and with Fire, and when by the Ministry he converted the Nations; for then were the Oracles accomplisht, the Law going forth from *Sion*, and the Light of *Jerusalem*; or when God sent the *Roman* Legions to destroy both the Place and the People. But 'twas not *John* the Baptist that chiefly prepared the way to these great Events. I say, that chiefly prepared it, because his Ministry was of short

short duration, and the preaching of the Apostles wrought quite another Impression from his. But 'tis Jesus Christ that made plain the Way of the Lord. He prepared the Way to God's Mercy by his Preaching and Miracles, his Death and Sufferings, by which he confirm'd his Truth, and Covenant, that was to be offered to the Nations even to the Ends of the Earth. Thus it would be Jesus Christ, and not *John* the Baptist, that was the Fore-runner describ'd by the Prophets : which is very absurd.

But if this Oracle is not verifi'd in the Coming of the Father, it must necessarily be verifi'd in the Coming of the Son ; and therefore in the Vision of the Prophets Jesus Christ bears the great Name of God, *the most High God, or the Lord, &c.*

The Second Oracle that offers it self to us, is that cited by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to shew the Difference that is between Jesus Christ and the Angels : the Oracle is taken out of the 102. Psal. *Thou, Lord, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall all wax Old as doth a Garment : and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy Tears shall not fail.* We cannot doubt but the Psalmist speaks thus of the Supreme God, since the Prophets have so often given us to understand, that the Supreme God alone made the Heavens and the Earth ; and besides, 'tis certain that the preceding Words can be only understood of the Supreme God. The Words are these : *Thou shalt arise, and have Mercy upon Zion, &c. So the Heathen shall fear the Name of the Lord : and all the Kings of the Earth his Glory, &c. The People which shall be created, shall praise*

the Lord, because he hath looked down from the height of his Sanctuary, and the Lord did from Heaven behold the Earth, &c. I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my Days; for thy Tears are throughout all Generations. Now this is he of whom the Psalmist says immediately after, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands. They shall perish, &c.*

Either the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not well understand, or he knew that it was the Supreme God that was describ'd by these grand Characters, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens, &c.* and that besides, these Characters were so peculiar to the true God, that there is no Example to be found in which the Prophets attribute 'em to any other. Thus when this Author applies this Oracle to Jesus Christ, we must own either that he looks upon Jesus Christ as being of one and the same Essence with his Father, or else that he speaks against his Conscience, and betrays the Interests of the Glory of the true God.

For to say, with the Socinians, that the Author of this Epistle does not apply these Words to Jesus Christ, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c.* but that quitting his first Discourse, and speaking no longer of Jesus Christ, he makes a short Apostrophe to God the Father: is not to tell us so much what the thing is, as what they heartily wish it were.

It is certain, that the Apostrophe would be very ill plac'd here. For it is not the Business of the Author effectually to exalt the Glory of God the Father. - The Hebrews, to whom the Epistle was written, never doubted of that: On the contrary, they preach'd up nothing else but his Grandure. Neither does the Sacred Author

thor parallel the Father with the Son, but he compares the Son of God with the Angels. The Hebrews had their mind full of the Revelation wherewith God had honour'd *Moses* and the Prophets. Our Author prefers the New Revelation to the Old, and makes the main advantage of the latter to consist in its having been made known by the Prophets, that is to say, by Servants, whereas the former was made known by the Son. God, says He, *who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in time past unto our Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, by whom also he made the World; which Son being the Brightness of his Glory, and the Express Image of his Person, and upholding all things by the word of his Power, when he had by himself purged our Sins, sat down on the right-hand of the Majesty on high.*

But because it might be objected, that the Law was given by the Ministration of Angels, or as others expound it, in the midst of Angels, the Sacred Author takes occasion from hence to shew us the advantage that Jesus Christ has above those noble Intelligences; and hereupon he gives us to understand, that indeed the Angels do bear in Scripture the glorious Title of Ministers of God: for being wrapt sometimes in Fire, and sometimes in a Whirlwind, they have frequently executed their Masters Orders, who *made his Messengers Spirits, and his Ministers a Flame of Fire;* but the Son partakes of his Father's Authority and God-head, according to our Author. He Participates of his Authority: this he proves by that Oracle: *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and the Sceptre of thy Kingdom is a Sceptre of Righteousness. Thou hast loved Righteousness; and hated Iniquity. Therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed*

thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows. Here then we see Jesus Christ receiving the Kingdom from his Father, and in this respect inferior to him. But because he also partakes with him of the God-head, or the Essential Glory of the Supreme Being, he afterwards applies to him such Oracles as equal him with his Father, and manifestly confound him with the Supreme Being, adding, without the least hint that he is speaking of another person: *And thou, Lord, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the works of thine Hands, &c.* Which Distinction of the Authority that he receiv'd, and of the Glory that he possesses naturally, is found in the first words of this Epistle: *Whom he hath appointed Heir of all Things, by whom also he made the World. He hath appointed Heir of all things:* here you see that Oeconomical Kingdom, in respect of which it was said, *Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity;* the Kingdom which he receiv'd from the Father: *By whom he made the World:* there's his natural Glory, his Essential Power in respect of which he applies to him this Oracle, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the works of thine Hands, &c.* This is that Participation of Power and of the God-head, which makes him to be in his Father God blessed for evermore, and his Father to be in him the Creator of the World, and of all things else.

From whence it appears, that the Apostrophe in this place is of no manner of Service to our Adversaries. For tho' it should serve 'em to avoid the Evidence of those words, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c.* how can they defend themselves against these, *By whom also he made the World, &c.* seeing these make an impression very little different from the other, it being plain, that He which made the World, may ve-

ry well have laid the Foundation of the Earth, and fashion'd the Heavens ?

Moreover, these Words, *thou remainest, thou art always the same, thy years shall not fail*, are understood of Jesus Christ, even in the Judgment of our Adversaries, who make no manner of difficulty to own it. And how is it possible they could disown it, since they are Synonymous with those that go before, and are incontestably understood of Jesus Christ, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever ?*

Again, they understand the renewing of the World by the Son of God in the last Day, by these Words, *Thou shalt fold them up as a Roll. They shall be changed.* They must then separate those last Words from these that went before, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands.* But this is ordinary with them. What ! they would in this Discourse, (*And thou, Lord, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest ; and they shall all wax old as doth a Garment ; and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy Tears shall not fail,*) oblige me to guess contrary to all the Rules of Language, contrary to the natural Impression of the Words, and the Sequel of the Discourse, in spite of common Sense ; they would, I say, oblige me to guess, that there are two Persons here spoken of, and that He of whom 'tis said, *Thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands*, is not the same with him of whom 'tis said immediately after, *Thou remainest, Thou shalt fold them up, &c.* Our Adversaries declare, that they will hearken to nothing but their own Reason, when they

dispute* against us : But here we will have no thing but our own Eyes to dispute against them.

C H A P. III.

A Continuation of the same Proof.

THE Third Oracle we shall produce, is that in the 6th Chap. of the Vision of the Prophet *Isaiab*, which is applied to Jesus Christ in the 12th Chapter of the Gospel according to St. *John* ; where the Evangelist speaking of the Unbelief of the Jews, expresseth himself thus : But though he had done so many Miracles before them, yet they believed not on him : that the Saying of *Esaïas* the Prophet might be fulfilled, which saith, Lord, who hath believed our Report ? or, to whom hath the Arm of the Lord been revealed ? Therefore they could not believe, because that *Esaïas* said again, He hath blinded their Eyes and hardened their Heart, that they should not see with their Eyes, nor understand with their Heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said *Esaïas*, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him. Nevertheless, among the Chief Rulers also, many believed on him ; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the Synagogue.

This Passage furnishes us with an invincible Argument for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. For, Two Things are certain. *First*, That the Evangelist St. *John* applies to Jesus Christ that splendid Appearance of God's Glory in the 6th Chap. of the Prophet *Isaiab*. And, *Secondly*, That 'tis the Glory of the Supreme God which is there described by the Prophet. We need only set down all the Passages of it, and

and we shall be presently convinced of this last Truth. In the year that King Uzziab dy'd, saith the Prophet, I saw the Lord sitting upon a Throne, high and lifted up, and his Train filled the Temple. Above it stood the Seraphims: each one had six Wings; with twain he covered his Face, and with twain he covered his Feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cryed unto another, and said, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of his Glory, &c. Then said I, Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a Man of unclean Lips, and I dwell in the midst of a People of unclean Lips, &c.

Methinks we need no extraordinary Penetration to be able to see into these two Truths. The first is, that 'tis the Glory of the Supreme God, which the Prophet *Esaias* describes: And the second is, that 'tis the Glory of Jesus Christ, which the Prophet saw, according to the Application made of this Oracle to the Gospel.

That 'tis the Glory of the Supreme Being, whereof the Prophet *Esaias* makes a Description, appears from all the Passages of the Description of it self. There is none but the Supreme God, whose Majesty can be so great, that the Seraphims cover themselves with their Wings before him. None but the Supreme God, whom the Seraphims celebrate in saying, *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God of Hosts*. And none but the Supreme God whose Presence can be so dreadful, as to make the Prophet cry out, *Wo is me, for I am undone, because I am a Man of unclean Lips, &c.* Nevertheless, my Eyes have seen the Lord, the Lord of Hosts.

And that the Evangelist applies this Oracle to Jesus Christ is much clearer. For 'twas of Jesus Christ that he spoke in the Verses preceding: and 'tis of Jesus Christ that he speaks in the

the Verses following. He spoke of him in the Verses preceding, when he said, *And though he had done so many Miracles before them, yet they believ'd not on him, that the saying of Esaias might be fulfilled, &c.* He speaks of him in the Verse following in these Words, *Nevertheless many of the Chief Rulers believed on him, &c.* Which puts it beyond all question, that 'tis he also of whom the Evangelist speaks, when he says, *They said Esaias when he saw his Glory and spake of him.*

From all which 'tis very easie to draw the Conclusion. *Esaias* saw the Glory of the Supreme Being. *Esaias* saw in the same place the Glory of Jesus Christ. Therefore Jesus Christ does not differ from the Supreme Being.

All this is evident : but what cannot Subtilty do, when 'tis resolv'd to eclipse the Brightest Truths?

It asserts Three Things, which are equally Unwarrantable. First, it pretends that the Pronoun *him* does not relate to Jesus Christ, but to God. Secondly, it refers these Words of the Evangelist, *Esaias said these things when he saw his Glory*, not to the Words immediately preceding, but to these which are at some distance from 'em, *Who hath believ'd our Report? or to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed?* And lastly, it maintains that the Prophet *Esaias*, in describing the Glory of God, describ'd also the Glory of Jesus Christ; because the Glory of Jesus Christ is contain'd in the Glory of God.

These are all very violent Palliations, and a Man must be exceeding blind not to perceive 'em. Who can believe that when St. *John* in the whole XII. Chap. of his Gospel is treating of Jesus Christ, and not at all of God his Father, these Words must relate to the Father, and not

his Son Jesus Christ, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him?* Who does not see that these last Words are to be taken in the same Sense, with these that follow immediately, *Nevertheless many of the Chief Rulers believed on him, &c.* So that as Jesus Christ is undoubtedly meant in this last Verse, Jesus Christ must be also meant in this before it, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him.* Which last Expression should, methinks, open our Adversaries Eyes. For the Prophet speaks of the Supreme God upon all manner of Occasions: this the Evangelists knew, and St. John could not be ignorant of it. *These things said Esaias, when he spake of God.* He said 'em therefore all his Life time, said 'em continually, and said 'em in every Page of his Prophecy.

This, say they, is a Parenthesis. But who would ye, Gentlemen, that this is a Parenthesis? Is there no more to do but to suppose without proving? But what if it were one, nevertheless his *Him* would still relate to Jesus Christ, because that in the preceding and subsequent Verses, the Evangelist speaks of Jesus Christ, and of him alone.

They pretend, secondly, that these Words of the Evangelists, *Esaias said these things when he saw his Glory, and spake of him*, belong not to the Words immediately preceding, but to the other Oracle cited before, *Lord, who hath believed our Report? or to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed?* But not to insist upon these Suppositions as made without Proof, or Foundation, how can it be said, that *Esaias* saw the Glory of the Lord in the Prophecy that begins thus? *Who hath believed our Report? or to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed?* since this Chapter is but a continual Description of our Saviour's Humiliation

tion, who is represented to us under the Characters of his Sufferings? I. By the meanes of his Extraction. *He shall grow up as a Root out of a dry Ground.* II. By the Disgrace that attend him. *We bid, as it were, our Faces from him.* III. By the Infirmities and Afflictions he endured. *He hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows.* IV. By his Patience and Suffering, all without Murmuring. *He opened not his Mouth: he is brought as a Lamb to the Slaughter, and as a dumb Sheep before her Shearer.* V. By the Benefit we reap from his Death. *For with his Stripes we are healed.* VI. By the Circumstance of his Burial. *He was found with the Rich in his Death.* VII. By his Death. *When his Soul shall be made an Offering for Sin, &c.* VIII. By his Intercession for Sinners. *Because he made Intercession for the Transgressors, &c.* It is true, 'tis said, that the Pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his Hand, and that he shall prolong his Days; but this Promise lies so conceal'd in these miserable Images of his Humiliation, that we do in a manner jest with sacred Things, if we call this a Vision of Jesus Christ's Glory.

If the Evangelist said simply, *Esaïas said these Things, when he spake of him*, we might think that by these things he understood that first Oracle cited by him before, *Lord, who hath believed our Report? or to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed?* Tho' in this case also, 'twere much more natural to refer what he says to what goes immediately before. But he expresses himself otherwise: *These Things said Esaïas, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him.* Now Esaïas saw his Glory, or at least reports he saw it, in the 6th Chap. and not in the 53d. where he sees only his Humiliation. We must therefore look in the 6th Chap. of his Vision to find the Prophecy

ency cited by our Evangelist, and which evidently describes the Glory of the Supreme God.

Much less can our Adversaries say, to elude this grand Proof, that *Esaïas* in seeing the Glory of the Supreme God, saw the Glory of Jesus Christ, because the latter is contain'd in the former. Certainly, if we may have recourse to such Evasions as these, there is nothing in general but what may be maintain'd. The Glory of God does eminently contain, not only the Glory of Jesus Christ, but also the Glory of all the Creatures without exception: and if so, the Evangelist might as well have apply'd the Oracle to us, as to Jesus Christ, by saying, *These Things said Esaïas, when he saw our Glory and spake of us.* And let me not be told, that this would be a Profanation. For, if the distance between the Glory of Jesus Christ and the Glory of the Supreme God, as infinite soever as it is, does not hinder but that what was only said of the Glory of the Supreme God, is apply'd to the Glory of Jesus Christ: then the distance between the Glory of Jesus Christ, and our Glory, being only finite, can never hinder an Oracle, which represents the Glory of Jesus Christ from being much more deservedly apply'd to us. In short, the Glory of Jesus, if he is but a mere Creature, can never be the same with God's; and the Peculiar and Essential Glory of the true God, such as *Esaïas* describes by Characters that belong only to him, can never be the same with Jesus Christ's; and I had as lieu say, he that sees the King's Glory, sees the Glory of the Bayliff of a Village, as to reply with our Adversaries, that *Esaïas* by seeing God's Glory, saw the Glory of Jesus Christ.

This

This is a most Triumphant Passage against our Adversaries. To which we shall add another as Triumphant.

CHAP. IV.

A Continuation of the same Proof.

TIS that Passage which the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* applies to Jesus Christ in these Words: *And again, when he bringeth in the First-begotten into the World, he saith, and let all the Angels of God worship him.* 'Tis agreed on both sides, that this Author applies in this place to Jesus Christ those Words in the 97th Psalm, v. 8. *Worship him, all ye Gods, or, all ye Angels* אֱלֹהִים for the Word in the Original is very frequently taken, according to the Rabbis themselves, for the Angels; and the Authority of the Holy Writer puts it beyond all doubt that it must be taken in this Sense here. Now to shew the invincible force of the Argument we take out of this Passage, we need only well establish the two important Truths. The first is, that the Psalmist speaks of the Supreme God, when he says, *Worship him all ye Gods, or, all ye Angels.* And the second, that these Words have been spoken of Jesus Christ. For from hence it will appear, that Jesus Christ does not essentially differ from the Supreme God.

To be convinced of the first, we need only to read the Psalm. *The Lord reigneth, saith the Psalmist, let the Earth rejoice, let the multitude of Isles be glad thereof.* Now why should the Earth and the Isles be concerned in the Glory of the

King

Kingdom, if 'tis not because the Kingdom of
 our Creator is meant? Further, the great Name
 of *Jehovah*, which is given near six times in this
 place to him, whose Kingdom the *Psalmist* de-
 scribes to us, being so often repeated and accom-
 panied with so many Characters of the Glory of
 the Supreme Being, could not be given to ano-
 ther without manifest Impiety. *Clouds and Dark-*
nesses are round about him: Righteousness and Judg-
ment are the Habitation of his Throne. A Fire go-
eth before him, and burneth up his Enemies round
about. His Lightnings enlighten the World: and
the Earth trembles at the sight of them. It cannot
be deny'd but these are the Characters of the
 Presence of that Almighty God, who having
 created the Heavens and the Earth, with all the
 visible Creatures, does also make use of them,
 when he pleases, to render his Majesty more
 conspicuous. *The Hills melt like Wax at the presence*
of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole
Earth. Now the Lord of the whole Earth is the
 Praise and Title of the Supreme God. Behold, saith
Hoshea, the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord of the
whole Earth shall go before you over Jordan. And in
the Book of the Prophet Zachariah: These are the
four Spirits of the Heavens, which go forth from stand-
ing before the Lord of all the Earth. And Micah 4.
3. Thou shalt consecrate their Riches unto the Lord,
and their Substance unto the Lord of the whole Earth.
 But the manner in which this Title is given him
 in the Oracle before us, is no less considerable
 than the Title it self. For the *Psalmist* design-
 ing to fix our Attention the more, and to fill us
 with a greater Admiration for the Supreme God
 of whom he speaks, redoubles his Expression,
 and says, with a singular Emphasis, *The Hills*
melt like Wax at the presence of the Lord, at the pre-
sence of the Lord of the whole Earth. The Heavens
declare

declare his Righteousness : and all the People see his Glory, adds the Sacred Author. The People see the Glory of the Supreme God sensibly set forth in all the parts of the Universe. The Heavens publish the Greatness and the Righteousness of the Supreme God, who made 'em for his own Glory. 'Tis then the Supreme God which is meant in this place. *Confounded be all they that serve graven Images, that boast themselves of Idols.* It is the True God, and the Supreme God, that is opposed to Idols ; 'tis the Supreme God that is to be glorified by the confusion of Idolaters : 'Tis then the Supreme God which is meant in this place. *Thou, Lord, art high above all the Earth : Thou art exalted far above all Gods, &c.* The Scripture renders it undeniable, that 'tis the true God that is spoken of in this place, since it gives us to understand, that God alone is to be Sovereignly exalted.

But if each of these Characters is capable of shewing that the True, the Great, the Supreme God is understood in this Psalm, certainly the collection of all these Characters forms in this respect the clearest and most evident Demonstration on that ever was.

It is however certain, that hereupon we naturally make these Three Reflexions. First, that if we refuse to acknowledge the Supreme God in this Psalm, we must necessarily grant, that we cannot acknowledge him in any Oracle or any Passage of the Old Testament. The reason is because he is describ'd here by the same Touches, and the same Characters that are given him throughout that Book, by his great and terrible Name *Jehovah*, a Name which he gave himself on an important Occasion, which he signaliz'd by a thousand Miracles, which he assum'd to be peculiar and incommunicable to himself, and which is

chara-

characteriz'd by the Authority he has over this World, and over all the Creatures that compose it, and by the marks of his Glory scatter'd thro' out Nature, &c. Secondly, that all Men that ever yet read this Sacred Psalm, and judg'd of it without prejudice, have thought that the Supreme God was there spoken of. Thirdly, that if 'tis any other than the Supreme God, that is describ'd by Characters so essential and peculiar to the Supreme God, there was never any thing (I will not say so equivocal and captious as this Expression, but also) more false and deceitful, since 'tis impossible it should have any other end but to deceive us.

'Tis surprizing after this, that Socinus durst apply all these Characters to Jesus Christ, and to Jesus Christ a mere Man by Nature. Since, saith He, *it is evident from the confession of all the World, that in this Psalm there is a Prophecy concerning the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, why could not Jesus Christ a Man, to whom was given all Power in Heaven and Earth, being consider'd as entring on the possession of his Kingdom, prophetically foretold and describ'd, be with reason call'd the Lord of the whole Earth?* Because, He that is call'd the Lord of the whole Earth in this Psalm, is describ'd by so many other Characters peculiar to the Supreme God, that 'twere an extravagance to offer to distinguish him from him; because, He that is the Subject matter of this 97. Psalm, is also the Subject matter of the rest, and particularly of the preceding Psalm, whose Glory is thus describ'd to us: *For all the Gods of the Nations are Idols: but the Lord made the Heavens. Honour and Majesty are before him: Strength and Beauty are in his Sanctuary. Give unto the Lord Glory, &c. Worship the Lord in his Sanctuary: fear before him all the Earth. Let the Heavens rejoyce, and let the Earth be glad: Let the*

T

Trees

Trees of the Wood shout for joy before the Lord. For he cometh, he cometh to judge the World, &c. Now a Man must be depriv'd of natural Light, not to see that these two Psalms are parallel. They both speak of God's Glory, his Coming and his Kingdom. They both exalt the true God above false Divinities. They both command to worshipt he Lord, the Eternal *Jehovah*, and they take their Motives from the Right he has over his Creatures. And they both invite the inanimate Creatures to rejoice at the Presence of God. Now 'tis certain, that this Psalm which goes before the Psalm before us, speaks of the Supreme God, as do so many others conceiv'd in much the same Terms, and consequently we cannot reasonably think otherwise of the Psalm before us.

I am somewhat loth to prove things so evident, but yet our trouble will not be altogether unprofitable, if it does but serve to stop our Adversaries Mouths, whose Wit is so exceeding fine. For, pray, what have they more to say, when they are shew'd, that 'tis the Supreme God which the Psalmist speaks of in this Oracle?

'Tis of the Supreme God that 'twas said, *Let all the Angels worship him*, or, which is the same thing, *Worship him, all ye Angels*. This Proposition hath been already prov'd, and is clear from all the Circumstances of the Oracle.

'Tis of Jesus Christ that 'twas said, *Let all the Angels worship him*. This the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says expressly, in applying to him this Oracle of the 97. Psalm; and our Adversaries cannot disown it, since they don't deny the truth of the Application.

Therefore let them draw the Consequence themselves, and acknowledge with us, that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, and is de-
scrib'd

scrib'd in the ancient Oracles as the Supreme Being.

'Tis in vain for Socinus to pretend to answer this Difficulty, by saying, that they who worship Jesus Christ, worship the Supreme God, because Jesus Christ represents the Supreme God in a singular manner and very eminent Sence. For the question here is not, whether in adoring Jesus Christ we adore the Supreme God; but whether it is not of Jesus Christ that 'twas said, *Let all the Angels of God worship him.*

If any one did resolve to maintain, that who-soever loves his Brother, does by the same Reason love God, because he loves his Brother only as he is the Image of God; he would say nothing but what is very warrantable: but if he would carry his Principle somewhat farther, and because in loving our Neighbour we love God in some measure, he would conclude, that when the Lawgiver saith, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c.* he speaks of our Neighbour, and not of God only; his Thought would be very extravagant. Thus also might it be own'd, that he who worships Jesus Christ, does in some measure worship the Supreme God, without being oblig'd to grant, that he who commands to Worship the Supreme God, does thereby command to worship Jesus Christ; there being no manner of Consequence from the one to the other.

In fine, if to elude the force of the Argument which we draw from this Passage, it were sufficient to say, that in adoring Jesus Christ, we adore the Supreme God, it follows, that this Oracle might be attributed to all the Kings of the Earth. For is it not true, that the Kings of the Earth do in some Sense bear the Image of God; that we honour them, because we look

upon 'em as God's Vicegerents upon Earth; and that consequently we may safely say, that he who honoureth Kings, honoureth the Deity it self? And if so, we may apply to the Kings of the World the Oracle which is in *Psalm 97.* as 'tis apply'd to Jesus Christ. For if this Oracle belongs to Jesus Christ, though it be understood only of the Supreme God; because in worshipping Jesus Christ, we worship the Supreme God: Nothing can also hinder us from saying, that it belongs to the Kings of the World; because in honouring Kings, we honour him whose Image they bear, viz. the Supreme God.

But, in short, the question is not what subtilty can invent to elude the Evidence of this Argument; but what is the Natural Impression that these Words of the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ought to make upon the Minds of Men, and whether they can be excus'd from taking them in the Sense we give them, when on one hand 'tis evident, that 'tis of the Supreme God that 'twas said, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*; and on the other, the Holy Ghost tells us, that 'tis to Jesus Christ himself that the application must be made.

And this shall suffice us to have examin'd these Oracles in all their particulars, not designing to enter upon a more distinct Examination of this Nature. We shall not here say, that Jesus Christ was call'd in the Ancient Oracles, *Emanuel, or God with us*; which shews, that he is not a mere Man; but 'twas said of him, *Sanctifie the Lord of Hosts; let him be your Fear and Dread, and he shall be to you for a Sanctification; for a stumbling Stone, and a stumbling Block to both the Houses of Israel; that every Knee should bow before him; that he was called the First and the Last.* That 'twas said of him, that he would send his Angel.

Angel, or his Messenger, before his Face ; that 'tis in speaking of him that the Psalmist cries out, The Earth is the Lords, and all that therein is, or the Fulness thereof ; that 'tis of him that the Psalmist speaks, Being ascended up on high, he bath led Captivity Captive, and given Gifts unto Men ; that 'twas of his Coming that the Prophet Esaias did Prophecy, when he said, God himself shall come, and shall save you. Then shall the Eyes of the Blind be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf shall be unstopp'd ; and in another place, Because 'twas thy Husband that made thee : the Lord of Hosts is his Name, and he shall be called the Redeemer, the Holy one of Israel, and the God of the whole Earth. And the Prophet Jeremy, This is his Name by which he shall be called the Lord our Righteousness ; and the Psalmist in the 2d. Psal. v. 12. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the Way, when his Wrath is kindled but a little ; bless'd are they that put their trust in him ! and as many more, which we do not here undertake so much as to enumerate.

CHAP. V.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that the Apostles did not apply the Ancient Oracles to Jesus Christ by mere Allusion or Accommodation.

TO see of what importance this Argument is, which we draw from the Application that the Apostles have made of the Ancient Oracles of the Scripture to Jesus Christ, we need only to examine whether in all those Passages which we have mention'd above, the Design of

the Holy Ghost speaking by the Prophets was to characterise Jesus Christ to us.

For if that was his Design, we must needs grant, that the Design of the Holy Ghost was to characterise Jesus Christ before-hand by those Titles which compose those Images, and consequently he would have us to look upon him as being *the Lord our God, Jehovah, our Fear and our Dread, He before whom every Knee is to bend, the King of Glory, the God of Hosts, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, &c.*

But if the Holy Ghost who inspir'd the Prophets with all these Oracles, did not design to represent by these Characters Jesus Christ, but only the Supreme God to us, it follows, that we ought to look upon this Application which the Apostles make of these Passages to Jesus Christ, as arbitrary, and a flight of their Fancy; or, if you will, as an Accommodation of the Old Scripture to present Events, founded on some sort of resemblance which is between the one and the other. Now though this kind of Accommodation be not without Example in Divine and Humane Language, yet 'tis certain they have no place on this occasion, and cannot in the least weaken our Argument, for Three Reasons.

First, because some of these Passages do uncontestably belong to Jesus Christ by the intention of the Spirit, that inspir'd the Prophets with 'em, as has been already shew'd in some of those Passages at large. And these will suffice to demonstrate in a most invincible manner, that Jesus Christ is invested with the peculiar Characters of God's Glory by the intention of the Holy Ghost.

Secondly, because the Design which the Apostles had in citing these Oracles, destroys the thought we might have had, that the Applicati-

ons

ons which they make of 'em of Jesus Christ are only Allusions or Accommodations. For if we well consider it, we shall find that their Design in this respect is constantly referr'd to one of these four Ends. They design either to prove from the Prophets the Divine Calling of Jesus Christ; or to shew his Excellency above all the Creatures, from the manner wherein God hath distinguish'd him from others in the Ancient Oracles; or to condemn the hardness of Heart among the *Jews*, and to lessen the scandal of it, by shewing that it was foretold; or lastly, to persuade us to render to Jesus Christ the Homages that are due to him, by shewing us that God has commanded us to pay 'em him.

First, the Apostles cite these Oracles with a design to prove his Calling. 'Twas upon this account that St. Peter in his Sermon to the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem* on the Day of Pentecost, cites this Prophecy out of *Joel*: *And it shall come to pass in the last Days, saith God, that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh, &c.* and a little after he applies it to Jesus Christ in these Words: *He therefore being exalted, &c. hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.* From this Instance, I draw one general Proof, and say, that the Apostles having a design to shew the Truth of their Master's Calling from the Ancient Oracles of the Scripture, they must have lost their Senses, if they did not see that they acted contrary to their own Intention, by applying to Jesus Christ such Oracles as express the most peculiar Glory of the Deity; since they were not ignorant that the great Stumbling-block of the *Jews* was, that they thought Jesus Christ had made himself equal and like to God; and consequently that whatever they cited out of Scripture, was proper to shew that Jesus

Christ was an Usurper of the Glory of the Deity, rather than the true Messiah.

The Second End which the Apostles propos'd to themselves, was to remove the Scandal given by the hardness of the *Jews* Hearts, and that by shewing that this Hardness of Heart had been foretold by the Prophets. 'Tis much upon this account that the Evangelist saith, *Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their Eyes and hardned their Heart, that they should not see with their Eyes, nor understand with their Heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.* These things said *Esaias*, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him. And remember that the Prophet saw the Glory of the Supreme God, as has been already observed. Now this design of shewing that the hardness of the Hearts of those that rejected the Messiah, had been foretold, should have oblig'd the Apostles to cite such Oracles out of the Scripture as in Truth and according to the common Tradition of their Teachers, respected the time of their Messiah, and were to be apply'd to him: so far were they from being oblig'd to make impious Applications to the Messiah of the Characters which do undoubtedly belong only to the Supreme Being; which would have justified the Proceedings of the Jews as to their part, and render'd their Unbelief very lawful.

A Third End of the Apostles, in citing the Scripture of the Old Testament in favour of Jesus Christ, is to shew us his Excellency, and the Advantage which he has over the Angels, and all the Creatures without exception, as appears from the 1. Chap. of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which we have already examin'd. But Arbitrary Allusions, Accommodations, and Applications are in no wise proper for this use. For, with what

what honesty can the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews prove to us, that the Scripture of the Old Testament speaks greater and nobler things of Jesus Christ than of the Angels, by Passages wherein the Holy Ghost had Jesus Christ as little in his Eye, as the Angels? Certainly if these are bare Accommodations, we need only a turn of Thought a little different from his, applying to some Angel what he applies to Jesus Christ, and we shall with as much Reason as he, draw Conclusions opposite to his.

Lastly, the Apostles have a *Fourth* Design in this kind of Citation, *viz.* to induce Men to the Worship and other Homages due unto Jesus Christ. 'Tis upon this account they cite the Oracles of Scripture, which sometimes command *all the Angels to worship him*, and sometimes declare, that *every Knee is to bend before him*. But it would be extravagant to think, that the Apostles ground upon Arbitrary Accommodations and Applications, (which, to speak properly, are no more than the resemblances which our imagination finds between the Ancient Oracles and Present Objects,) that, I say, the Apostles ground here upon the Religious Worship, or Adoration of Jesus Christ, which ought to be establish'd upon express Commands, or else upon such Oracles as prescribe it. In this case the Apostles would be as mad, as a Man that should prove a private Soldier to deserve the Titles of Majesty, and to be honour'd as a Prince and Conquerour, because he met with some Action, or some Words in the History of *Alexander the Great*, which might by way of Allusion or by a peice of Wit be apply'd to him.

The Third Reason, which perswades us that these Accommodations can be of no use here, is,

is, that they would be impious and full of Blasphemy, if Jesus Christ were not of one and the same Essence with his Father. For if out of respect to Jesus Christ you would not dare to apply to another Man this Oracle, *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the Sins of the World*: the respect which we have for the Supreme Being ought also more forcibly to hinder us from investing Jesus Christ with the essential Characters of his Glory. For two things are certain. First, That the Disproportion between Jesus Christ, and the Supreme God, is, if the Sentiment of our Adversaries be true, infinitely greater than that which is between Jesus Christ and another Man. Secondly, that the Character describ'd by these Words, *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the Sins of the World*, is not so peculiar to Jesus Christ, as the Characters describ'd in the Passages of the Prophets are to the Supreme God. Jesus Christ is in such a manner *the Lamb of God*, according to our Adversaries, that another might have been so as well as he, if it had pleas'd the Lord: but God is in such a manner *Jehovah, the mighty God, the God of Hosts, the King of Glory, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, &c.* that not any one can share this Glory with him. If then 'tis look'd upon as Blasphemy to apply to any other but Jesus Christ these Words, *Behold the Lamb of God, &c.* how much more impious would it be to apply to Jesus Christ all those grand Titles of the Most High God? For, in the first Case, there would be only one Passage misapply'd: but in the last, there are a great many misapply'd. In the first Case, 'twould be only such a Character of Jesus Christ apply'd to another, as is peculiar without being essential to his Nature: but in the last, the Characters are such

are both Peculiar and Essential to God's Nature. In the first Case, there is prejudice done to the Glory of a Creature belov'd of God: but in the last, the Glory of God himself is wrong'd. In the first Case, the Danger is only this, least Scandal be given by an Allusion that is somewhat impious: but in the last, there would not be Scandal only, but Seduction; since the Apostles would betray Men into this dismal Superstition, which would confound the Creature with the Creator.

We may then fret and fume as much as we please, wrack our Wits and Fancy, labour to render some Books of the Holy Scripture suspected, and speculate on the manner how the Apostles were inspir'd, as much and as long as we please; yet 'tis all to no purpose, whilst these two Truths remain certain. *First*, that the Apostles have apply'd to Jesus Christ, whether by way of Accommodation, Allusion, or otherwise, certain Passages of the Prophets which characterise the Supreme God. And *Secondly*, that if Jesus Christ does not partake of the Glory of the Divine Essence, and is but a mere Creature, to which consequently all these Characters do not belong; we must look upon the Apostles as Men that betray others into Idolatry by most impious Witticisms, and most blasphemous Applications of the Holy Scripture.

From all which 'tis plain, that if the Sentiment of our Adversaries were true, it must necessarily follow, that neither the Prophets exactly foretold Things to come, nor the Apostles understood the Prophets, and that consequently there would be no manner of Harmony between the Old and New Testament. And this is a very powerful Consideration: to which nevertheless shall be added another, which is somewhat more pressing.

S E C T.

S E C T. V.

Wherein 'tis shew'd, that if Jesus Christ is not God over all Blessed for Evermore, Religion must be look'd upon as a Superstition, and mere Farce ; and that it has not Characters enow to distinguish it from Magick.

C H A P. I.

A Proof of this Assertion, taken from the Consideration of the Mosaick Religion.

TO comprehend well the Truth of so extraordinary and surprizing an Assertion, it is very proper to observe in what manner God was pleas'd to manifest himself in the Old and New Testament.

In the Old Testament, God manifests himself to *Moses* upon Mount *Horeb* in a burning Bush : but 'tis observable, that he who appears to *Moses*, is called the Angel of the Lord. And the Angel of the Lord, saith the Sacred Historian, appear'd to him in a Flame of Fire, &c.

And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great Sight &c. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, he called unto him, and said, Moses, Moses, &c. I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, &c. There is hardly any body, but knows all the Particulars of this great Vision, and how Moses contending with the Lord, because he refus'd to go to Pharaoh, on pretence that he had an Impediment in his Speech, is rebuked by him for his Blindness after this manner: *Who hath made the Deaf, or the Dumb, or the Seeing, or the Blind? Have not I the Lord?* 'Tis known also, that upon this important occasion, God gives himself a new and most extraordinary Name. For as Moses asks him what he should say to the Children of Israel, when they ask him, *Who is He that sent thee?* the Lord saith to him, *Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel: He that calleth himself I AM THAT I AM, hath sent me unto you.* And that they may not imagine that he speaks to them of an unknown God, he adds, *Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel: The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.* 'Tis further notorious, that He who appears to Moses in the Bush, promises him to smite Egypt with all his Wonders, and to deliver the Israelites by a mighty hand, and a stretched-out arm. So that there is no manner of doubt, but that He who speaks to Moses in the Bush, is the very same that addresses himself to the People of Israel prostrated at the Foot of the Mount, in these Words: *I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage, &c.* and consequently the very same that gives his Law to the People of Israel. For thus saith the Lord unto Moses: *When thou goest*

est to return into Egypt, see that thou do all the Wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine Hand : But he shall not let the People go, &c.

He that manifests himself to *Moses*, is, according to our Hypothesis, the Lord and the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of the Covenant, the Eternal Wisdom, the Son of God, God blessed for evermore.

But as soon as we quit this Hypothesis, 'tis certain that we can hardly avoid looking upon the *Mosaic* Religion as an Idolatry, and a Farce designed to deceive us; and also that we should hardly find Characters in it to distinguish it from *Magic*: which are indeed very horrible and hideous Ideas, and such as I dread to debauch my Paper with; but yet, out of a desire to set so great a Truth in all its Light, I am forc'd to use 'em in spite of my Teeth.

He then that appears to *Moses* is the Angel of the Lord. We are not to doubt of it, since the Text says so expressly; and 'tis impossible to make the least Figure in the Case. For though the Angel of God might by a Figure bear the Name of God, yet we are well assur'd that God the Father cannot by any Figure be called the Angel of the Lord.

Which being thus suppos'd, we here find a Creature that invests it self with the Names, the Works, the Attributes, and the Glory of the Creator, in such a manner, that 'tis impossible for the Wit of Man to help confounding it with the Supreme God. For the Angel of the Lord is here call'd the Lord himself; he says, that he is the God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac* and of *Jacob*: and thereby attributes to himself the seven Names which the Hebrews were wont to give their God, whether to distinguish him from the Creatures, or to separate him from the

false

false Gods of the Heathens, or to express the Eminency of his infinite Perfections.

But it is not sufficient to observe that this Angel takes to himself the Names of God; we must also consider, that he takes them on such an Occasion, as was of the greatest importance in the World not to take 'em. For he takes them at a time when he cannot do it without deceiving him to whom he manifests himself, and so deceiving him as to betray him into Idolatry, and at a time when *Moses* desires not to be deceiv'd, when he approaches to see nearer at hand who it is that appears to him, and at a time when 'tis of the highest importance to him to know from whom he is to speak to the People of *Israel*, and who it is that sends him.

Add to this, that he who manifests himself to *Moses*, being not content with those Names which the God of *Abraham*, &c. took to make himself known to the Patriarchs, gives himself a new Name, which he declares shall be his Name for ever, and his Remembrance to all Generations. Now, though it were true, that a Creature might upon some occasions bear the Name of God, yet 'tis certain, that no Creature can give himself a new Name of God, by putting or supposing himself in his Stead; and that so much the more, because God, speaking by the Mouth of the Prophets, saith, *My Name is Jehovah, that is my Name*. But what do these Words signifie? They cannot import that the Name of *Jehovah* is common to the Creator and the Creature: but they naturally signifie, that this Name is peculiar to the Supreme God, and consecrated to that adorable Essence; that it belongs so to God, that it belongs not to another. How comes it then that we here find an Angel not only taking

taking this Name, but giving it to himself, by supposing himself the God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac* and of *Jacob*?

But the most considerable thing is, that the Angel of the Lord does not here take the *Names* of God only, but also he attributes to himself his Works. For what do these words signifie? *Have not I made Man's Mouth, have not I made the Deaf, or the Dumb, or the Seeing, or the Blind?* these words evidently import, that he who speaks supposeth himself to be the Creatour of all Things.

The God of *Abraham* is call'd by *Melchisedec* the God Possessor of Heaven and Earth. He is called, the Dread of *Isaac*. And *Jacob* calls him, the God Almighty. 'Tis he that causeth the *Harvests* to grow, and shoot up, &c. The Angel of the Lord gives himself all these Titles, in that he calls himself the God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*.

Lastly, It cannot be deny'd but that he invests himself with the Glory of the Supreme Being. since he commands *Moses* to put off his Shoes from off his Feet, because the Place whereon he standeth is holy Ground; and after he had brought the People out of the Land of *Egypt*, the same Angel (for we have shew'd that 'tis the same) speaks to him thus: *Thou shalt have no other God before me.*

Now it seems that the Spirit designs hereby to render the *Israelites* guilty of Impiety and Idolatry: of Impiety; because if the Supreme God is much more worthy of our Adoration than this Angel, how durst the Angel say so generally and without any restriction, *Thou shalt have no other God before me.* And of Idolatry; because since this Angel (with what Character soever he be invested) is not yet the Supreme God, how

how durst he require such Homages as are most peculiar to the Supreme God? In effect, when the Law of the Decalogue commands us to worship the Lord, and to worship him only, either it means to speak of a Supreme Worship, or of a Subordinate Worship. (We have explained elsewhere what is to be understood by these two Terms.) If the Law speaks only of a Subordinate Worship, then we may say, that there is no mention made of Supreme Worship throughout the whole Decalogue. If the Law speaks of Supreme Worship, as is acknowledg'd by our Adversaries themselves, it follows, that the Angel of the Lord, though he was not the Lord, or the Supreme God, has yet requir'd of the *Israelites* a Supreme Worship which is only due to the most High God; and that consequently he has betray'd 'em into Idolatry.

Now in this Idolatry are Three surprizing Characters.

The *First* is, that 'tis innocent on the part of the *Israelites*. They are not to be blamed, if they think that he who calls himself the God of their Fathers is really the Supreme God; and that he who boasts that *he made Man's Mouth, and that he made the Deaf and the Dumb, the Seeing and the Blind*, was the Creator of all things: neither were they to be blamed for paying to him, whom they look'd upon as the Creator, and the Mighty God, a Supreme Worship.

The *Second* is, that 'tis an Idolatry of Divine Institution, if I may be allowed to speak so. Ordinarily Idolatry and Superstition spring from the bottom of our Corruptions, and owe their Birth to those Passions which fasten us to the Earth: but this is such a Superstition and Idolatry as has its rise from Divine Revelation, if it be true that the Revelation of *Moses* ought

to be honour'd with that Title. For 'tis God himself that sends his Angel, that invests him with the most peculiar and essential Characters of his Glory; or at least 'tis an Angel that pretends to be God, and confounds himself with him. In effect, when this Angel says to *Moses*, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*, either he has a design to pass for the God of those Patriarchs, or he has not. If he has not this Design, then his Discourse is impertinent from the beginning to the end. And if he has, 'tis he that betrays the Children of *Israel* into Superstition and Idolatry.

The *Third* Character which we find in this Idolatry, is, that 'tis necessary and inevitable. For, that the *Israelites* might have been able to avoid it on this occasion, 'twas necessary they should have been able to doubt of one of these two Truths: that the Supreme God manifesting himself to Men, was not worthy of the Adoration and Worship which he requir'd: or that he who manifested himself to *Moses*, and afterwards manifests himself to the People on *Sinai*, was not the Supreme God, though 'twere *He that maketh the Deaf, and the Dumb, the Seeing and the Blind*.

'Twill be here to no purpose to say, that the Angel of the Lord speaks in the Person of him whom he represents, and that 'tis as Ambassador of the Most High God that he bears the Names and Titles of God. For, first, if he is only the Ambassador of the Supreme God, he should have told *Moses* so, when *Moses* asks him who he is, and desires to know who sends him, that he may tell the Children of *Israel*. He should then have said to him, *I am the Messenger, or, the Ambassador of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*, and not, *I am the God of Abraham of Isaac,*

Isaac, and of Jacob. Secondly, an Ambassador does not send another Ambassador, as this Angel does, who delivers the Children of *Israel* out of the Land of *Egypt*, and says, he will send his Angel before 'em, and will put his Name upon him, that is to say, his Glory; for the Name of God is, as every one knows, taken for his Glory, witness that Expression of the Lord's Prayer, *Hallowed be thy Name*: and the meaning is, that he would make him the Depository of his Wonders, and the Instrument of his Power. Thirdly, an Ambassador does not give new Names to his Master, and that in speaking in his Person, and putting himself in his place. Fourthly, an Ambassador that represents the King cannot say, *He shall acknowledge no other King but me*; for then he loses the Quality of a faithful Subject, and becomes the Enemy of his Prince. Fifthly, an Ambassador does not attribute to himself the Personal Merit of the Prince, as his Wisdom, Understanding, &c. as you see this Angel attributes to himself the Attributes and Qualities of God: his Power, as when he takes it ill that *Moses* will not obey him, who made *Man's Mouth*: his Justice; For, saith he, *I will not hold him guiltless that taketh my Name in vain*: his Compassion; as when he says, that *he sheweth Mercy unto thousands of them that fear him and keep his Commandments*. In a word, never did any Ambassador attribute to himself the Names, the Titles, the Works, the Homages and all the Glory of him whom he represents, without any restriction or limitation, without provoking the Jealousie of his Master, and rendring himself guilty of High-Treason. For an Ambassador is call'd to procure the Glory of his Master, and not to rob him of the Homages that belong to him.

They may search as much as they please for Examples capable to authorize such a Conduct, yet I dare venture to say, they'll find only one, which is that of the Stage, where we see a private Person assume all the Names and Titles of the King he represents; as also he attributes to himself his Works, and requires his Homages: but we know that all of it is false, and fictitious; that there is nothing serious in it; and that if those who Act upon the Stage did seriously pretend to the Allegiance and Homages of the Spectators, they would deserve to be laught at, and would be guilty of High-Treason. It were horrible Blasphemy, to conceive the Religion of *Moses* as a Fiction and Comedy, wherein an Angel should play, as 'twere, the part of the Supreme Being; because this would be to make the God of Truth the God of Imposture. This would be to charge him with abusing our Credulity and Weakness, and to make a wicked Farce of it; which would not only deceive Men, but would also deprive God of the Worship and Homages that belong to him, to give 'em to the Creature, to whom they do not belong.

What could an Angel of Darknes do, who had a design to seduce Men, by drawing them away from the Obedience and Worship of the True God, what else could he do, but invest himself with the Names, Titles, and Works of the Deity, and tell the *Israelites*, *I am the God of Abraham*, *the God of Isaac*, and *the God of Jacob*?

We cannot suppose that He who speaks to the *Israelites* is a mere Creature, except we grant that a mere Creature would have pass upon this Occasion for the God of the *Hebrews*. For, how is it possible to conceive, that an Angel, who does not design to pass for the God of *Israel* should,

in speaking to a Man whom he is to inform who he is, say and declare to him, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* ?

But if He is a mere Creature, and we cannot help thinking that He designs to put himself in the place of God, we do hereby charge him with Impiety, and a design to betray us into Idolatry; And if we afterwards find that he works any Miracles, these Miracles may be justly suspected by us, because the Law it self obliges us to judge of Miracles by the Doctrine that attends them, and not of a Doctrine by its Miracles. *If there arise among you, saith He; a Prophet, or a Dreamer of Dreams, &c.* In a word, Religion does insensibly lose its Characters; and when as 'tis a Communion with God, we conceive a horrible Suspicion, that 'tis no more than a Trick of the Spirit of Darknes.

Indeed this thought is hideous; but we cannot easily lose it in this first Supposition. For what Characters will you afterwards find in Religion to induce you to acknowledge it for Celestial and Divine? If you tell me of its Holiness, this is what is most of all call'd into Question. What Holiness can be found in a Religion whose Essential Principles are Impiety and Idolatry? If you say, that God spoke to *Moses*; 'tis shew'd you, that 'twas not God that appear'd to him, but a Spirit that would have put himself in the place of God. If you alledge the many Miracles God wrought by the Ministry of *Moses*; 'twill be answer'd you, that great Miracles were wrought by *Pharaoh's* Magicians; and that at farthest no more can be inferr'd from thence, but that the Spirit which acted by *Moses*, was stronger than the Spirit which favour'd the Magicians: Miracles being not to be well prov'd, or well acknowledg'd to come from the Power of the Spirit

Spirit of God, but when they are accompanied with Holiness; which is the very Character we want, if we suppose Impiety and Idolatry in the Religion of *Moses*.

CHAP. II.

A Continuation of the same Proof.

FOR the better understanding that this Angel who reveals himself to *Moses*, incroacht upon the Interests of the Glory of the Supreme God, supposing he is a mere Creature, you need only observe three things considerable on this occasion. The first is, that God's design was to exalt Jesus Christ above all the Angels. For, 'tis said of him, *Let all the Angels worship him*. He has obtain'd a more Excellent Name than they. This is the Doctrine of the Sacred Author. For, *to which of the Angels, saith he, said he at any time, sit thou on my Right-hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool?*

The Second Thing observable is, that Jesus Christ, according to our Adversaries, was Exalted above the Angels, not upon the account of his Nature, it being certain that the Angelical Nature is effectually in it self above the Excellency of the Humane Nature; but upon the account of the Office, Trusts, or Gifts, which he receiv'd. For if we are to appeal to their Opinion, 'tis only on the account of his Office that he is called God.

The Third is, that if 'tis an Angel which appears to the Patriarchs and to *Moses*, and which delivers the *Israelites* out of their Captivity, we must

must grant, that an Angel was more exalted and more honour'd than Jesus Christ, contrary to God's Design.

In effect, *Jesus Christ*, according to our Adversaries, was call'd God by a kind of Analogy; and *God* is call'd the God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac* and of *Jacob*. *Jesus Christ*, according to them, is only worshipt with a Subordinate Worship. And *God* causes himself to be worshipt as the Supreme Being. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.* Jesus Christ attributes to himself the Works of God. And this Angel attributes them to himself more clearly still, by saying, *Who hath made the Deaf, or the Dumb, or the Seeing, or the Blind? Have not I the Lord? I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage.* He was also called elsewhere, *The God, Possessor of Heaven and Earth, the Dread of Isaac, He that maketh the Harvests to grow, the Judge of the whole Earth, before whom Abraham was but Dust and Ashes, &c.* For it appears, that 'tis the same Angel of the Lord of whom all these things are said.

But if this Angel has taken such Names and Titles as our Adversaries refuse to give Jesus Christ himself, they ought to own, that this Angel usurps the Glory of God; and if he usurps God's Glory, that he is the Idol of the *Israelites*, and betrays them into Impiety and Idolatry. Now, supposing that he betrays 'em into Impiety and Idolatry, it appears uncontestable that the Religion which this Angel teacheth, has not Characters enow to distinguish it from Magick. Indeed you meet with many wonderful and supernatural things in it; but you find them wrought by a Spirit which usurps the Glory of the True God, who even durst command you

to have no other God before him; which is one of the Characters of the Spirit of Darknes: And what a horrible Thought, what a blasphemous and extravagant Suspicion would not this be? Does the Spirit of Darknes concern himself in the Piety and Holiness of Men, to give 'em so perfect and pure a Law? No, undoubtedly: And you may thence conclude, that the Principle which leads us to this monstrous Imagination, cannot but be very false.

CH A P. III.

Wherein the same thing is establish'd in respect of the Christian Religion.

TO proceed further: what we have said of the Angel that appear'd to *Moses*, the same we may say of our Saviour Jesus Christ, supposing, as is pretended, that they are really distinct one from the other.

If Jesus Christ is not of one and the same Essence with his Father, we cannot doubt but that Jesus Christ design'd to seat himself on the Throne of the Deity, by usurping his Names, Titles, and his most peculiar and essential Glory: And consequently we must look upon his Religion, first, as a detestable Superstition; secondly as an impious Farce; and, thirdly, as a Work of the Spirit of Darknes, rather than of the Holy Ghost.

In effect, 'tis certain, that the New Testament attributes to Jesus Christ all the Works of God; the Creation of all things, which had always characteris'd the God of *Israel*; the Preservation

servation of all things, which belongs to the Creator; the Redemption of the World, which the Prophets would refer only to the Supreme God, &c. 'Tis plain, that the same Scripture attributes to him the Power of God, the Eternity of God, the Immensity of God, the Providence of God, the Justice and Mercy of God. We see that Jesus Christ is represented to us as being One with God, Equal with God, and the Same with God. Certain it is, that he is called in Scripture, *the Lord, the Lord of Glory, Lord God, God manifested in the Flesh, the Great God and Saviour, the Mighty God, the True God, the Most High, God over all blessed for evermore*; and I affirm, that a Creature who design'd to invade the Glory of God, by investing himself with those Characters which are most peculiar to him, could have taken no other way, nor have better succeeded in this Design. But that we may not be charged with making a suspected heap of controverted Passages, it will be proper to consider them a little by themselves.

First then, I say, that the Scripture attributes to him all the Works of God. For, to begin with the Work of Creation, could the Apostle St. Paul have better given this Character to Jesus Christ, than by so express and remarkable Words as these? *For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and Colos. 1. that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers: all Things (I say) were created by him and for him. He is before all Things, and by him all Things subsist.* It will do the Socinians no Service to cavil here, and change the Word *Created* into *Renewed*, or *Reconciled*. For these last Words, *All Things are by him and for him. He is before all Things, and by him all Things subsist,* do

do plainly shew, that there is no Metaphorical Creation understood in the Case. Besides, this Passage is sufficiently explained by several other places of Scripture, which say, that *there is One only Lord, by whom are all Things*; that *Jesus Christ made the World*, that *he made the Worlds*, that *all Things were made by him*, and that *without him was not any thing made that was made*; that *he laid the Foundation of the Earth*, and that *the Heavens are the Works of his Hands*, &c. But if all these Expressions are to be taken out of their natural Use, and common Signification, we cannot help thinking that the Holy Ghost had a design to deceive us. The Second Work attributed by the Scripture to Jesus Christ, is the Preservation of the World. A Sacred Author says expressly, that *he upholdeth all things by the Word of his Power*. The Third is, the Redemption of Mankind. 'Tis said, that *God has purchased to himself the Church with his own Blood*, which are remarkable Words, and shew us, both that Jesus Christ is God, and that he ransom'd us in Quality of God: It being most apparent, that the Apostle here joins the Name of God with the Word *Purchase*, only to make us reflect on that ancient Oracle: *God himself shall come, and shall save you*; and then *shall the Eyes of the Blind be opened*, &c. The Scripture attributes to Jesus Christ in the Fourth place, the Work of Providence; and particularly the ordinary care of Believers. Behold, saith he, *I am with you to the end of the World*. And in another place, *Where Two or Three are gathered together in my Name, there will I be in the midst of them*: Which is such a Promise as Jesus Christ could not perform as Man, but only as God; because, as Man, he is limited by Time and Place, but, as God, he acts independently on both. For to say that he

found in the midst of us by his Spirit, is no Answer at all. If the Spirit we receive is the Spirit of Jesus Christ, it follows, that he is God, in that he acts and operates every where: and if 'tis the Spirit of the Supreme God, we must say, that 'tis his Father, and not he, that is with us. Again, tho' it were true to say, that Jesus Christ were in us by Faith, which is a Gift of the Holy Ghost, yet how would he be in the midst of us? For there is somewhat more particular in this last Expression. In short, *Elisha* received a Portion of the Spirit of *Elijah*, because he received from God such Gifts as were like to those of *Elijah*; and yet 'tis never said, that *Elijah* was with the Jews, nor in the midst of their Assemblies after his Ascension into Heaven. The Fifth Work, which is manifestly attributed to Jesus Christ, is the Work of our Sanctification. *Tis he that disputes our Errors. He inlightneth every Man that cometh into the World. He teacheth us, because the Truth is in him. Unto every one of us is given Grace, according to the measure of the Gift of Christ. We are made alive by Christ, and are saved by his Grace: and yet Sanctification is a most Divine Work. For 'tis God that worketh in us with Power both to will and to do of his own good Pleasure. Sixthly, the Scripture attributes to Jesus Christ the Glorification of Believers. Because thou hast kept the Word of my Patience, saith our Saviour in the Revelation, I also will keep thee from the Hour of Temptation which shall come upon all the World. Him that overcometh, will I make a Pillar in the Temple, &c. He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white Raiment, and I will not blot out his Name out of the Book of Life, &c. To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me on my Throne, &c.*

Eph. 4.

Ibid. ch.2.

We

We may venture to say, in the Second place, that the Scripture attributes to Jesus Christ all the Attributes of God : The Power of God, in that 'tis by the *Word of the Power of Jesus Christ* that all things subsist : The Knowledge of God, in that 'tis said of Jesus Christ, that he *searcheth the Hearts, and tryeth the Reins*; and St. Peter says to him, *Lord, thou knowest all things* : the Eternity of God, in that he is called *the Father of Eternity*; and that Oracle, which had for its Object the Supreme God, is apply'd to him : *They shall perish, but thou remainest, and thy Tears shall not fail* : The Immensity of God, in that 'tis said of Jesus Christ, when upon Earth, that he is in Heaven. *No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven*; even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven; and Jesus Christ is since his Ascension found still in the midst of us; and being in Heaven, where he sitteth at the Right Hand of God, he receiveth St. Stephen's Spirit, commending it into his Hands, and saying, *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit* : the Invisibilty of God, which in the Stile of the Scripture carries in it somewhat very peculiar to God, in that Jesus Christ is call'd *the Image of the invisible God* : the Understanding of God, in that also Jesus Christ is called by the Sacred Writers, *the Wisdom of God* : the Faithfulness and the Truth of God, in that upon this account he is called *the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness*, and also by way of Excellence *the Truth it self* : the Mercy of God, in that he pardoneth Sin, washeth it, and justifieth us by his Blood : the Authority of God, in that Jesus Christ causeth the Gospel to be preached to the World in his own Name, and sendeth his Disciples to baptize throughout the Earth, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; he layeth his Commands on the

unclean Spirits, as being the Lord of Nature, and faith to them, *Thou Deaf and Dumb Spirit, I command thee to come forth out of him*; he giveth power to others to work Miracles in his Name; and the Lame are seen to rise up, and to walk in the Name of Jesus Christ, as the Prophets wrought Miracles in the Name of God: the Justice of God, in that 'tis of Jesus Christ that *John* the Baptist saith, *Whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Floor, and gather his Wheat into the Garner: but he will burn up the Chaff with unquenchable Fire*: and the Severity of God towards his Children whom he chastises and exercises with sundry Afflictions, which his Providence sends 'em; for Jesus Christ says of himself in this Sence, *I rebuke and chastise all those whom I love. Take up therefore thy Zeal, and repent.*

CHAP. IV.

A Continuation of the same Proof.

It must be also acknowledg'd, in the Third place, that Jesus Christ bears in Scripture the most eminent Titles of the Deity. 'Twas said of God, *Thou alone are the Most High*. And *Zacharias* calls Jesus Christ *the Highest*, before whose Face his Son was to go. The Majesty of God was describ'd in the Ancient Oracles by the Title of *King of Glory*. And Jesus Christ is call'd in the New Testament, *the Lord of Glory*. *They would never have crucified the Lord of Glory*. God was called *the Holy One*, that is to say, the Ho-
Thou only
art Holy.
Rev. 15.

the

the Prophets: he is called *the thrice Holy* of *Esaias*. And Jesus Christ is, according to the Sacred Authors, *the thrice Holy and True*; as he is also called *the Redeemer, the Saviour, the Prince, or the King of Kings, and the Lord of Lords, the First and the Last, who liveth for evermore, &c.* which are all the Titles of the Supreme Being.

To which must be added, that according to the Ideas given us in the New Testament, Jesus Christ is One with God, Equal with God, the Same with God. He is One with God: for Jesus Christ gives us plainly to understand so when he says to us, *I and my Father are One*. And here they must not object to us, that it is uncertain whether an Unity of Nature, or a Unity of Concord be meant in this place; and that an Unity of Concord seems rather to be understood here, than an Unity of Nature, because Jesus Christ exhorts us elsewhere to be One with him, even as he is One with his Father. So that as we are One with Jesus Christ only by an Unity of Concord and Consent, and not at all by an Unity of Essence and Nature; we may conclude, that Jesus Christ is not One with his Father by an Unity of Nature, but only by an Unity of Concord. For this Objection does not in the least diminish the Strength of our Argument. For, as when Jesus Christ exhorts us to be Perfect, as our Father which is in Heaven is Perfect, we do not understand his Word rigorously and according to the Letter, and do not believe that Jesus Christ commands us to be as Perfect as God is, but only to take the Holiness of God as the Pattern of our Actions and to imitate it as much as may be, and our Capacities can bear: So, when Jesus Christ commands us to be One with Him, as He is One with his Father, he does not mean to to

us, that our Communion with Him, ought to be as strong and of the same Nature as his Unity with his Father ; for that is impossible, and 'twould be extravagant to think so : but he only means, that his Unity with the Father ought to be as the Pattern of that Communion which we ought to have with him ; but yet 'tis a Pattern of Resemblance, and not (if I may be allow'd the Expression) a Pattern of Identity. In short, whatever the Sence of these Words is, *Be ye One, as I and the Father are One*, 'tis nevertheless reasonable to think, that when in St. John, Chap. 10. Jesus Christ says, *I and my Father are One*, he means an Unity of Essence, or Nature. For, having declared in the Verses preceding, that *his Sheep shall never perish*, and that *no Man shall pluck them out of his Hand*, he adds, *I and my Father are One*, to confirm this thought: which is evidently to say, *We are One by an Unity of Power*. Now he that says that two are one by an Unity of Power, does also necessarily say, that they are one by an Unity of Essence and Nature. An ordinary Man may be one with God by an Unity of Consent ; having no more to do but to submit himself to the Orders of his Providence: but for all that, he cannot, and ought not to say, *These or Those shall never perish, neither shall any Man pluck them out of my Hand. For I and my Father are One*. This would be mad Language indeed, because it naturally signifies an Unity of Essence and Power, which in no wise belongs to the Man we speak of. But that which removes all our Doubts in the Case, is, that this Expression is supported by a thousand other Expressions, by which 'tis explain'd.

Amongst which I place that Equality with God, which the Scripture attributes to Jesus Christ. I will suppose, that in these words, *He*
thought

thought it no robbery to be Equal with God, this Expression, *He thought it no robbery*, is obscure or equivocal; 'tis however true, that the Scripture attributes to Jesus Christ a kind of Equality with his Father; and, whatever this Equality is, it invincibly shews us, that Jesus Christ is One with his Father, not merely by an Unity of Consent (for to be one with God by this kind of Unity, it is not necessary to be equal with him,) but by an Unity of Essence or Nature, for otherwise God's Oracle speaking by the Prophets is still in force, *Who is like unto me?* Whatever is said on this occasion to obviate this Argument is of no manner of Service. 'Tis said, that this Equality, is Figurative and Hyperbolical. But have they well observ'd, that tho' the Sacred Writers do sometimes use an Hyperbole, yet they always avoid it when this Figure may prejudice God's Glory, by making an unworthy Comparison of the Creature with the Creator? Some have said that Jesus Christ was Equal with God, because God the Father had exalted him to his Equality. But they don't know what they say when they talk at this Rate. It implies a contradiction, that God exalts any one to his equality, because he cannot exalt any one without being Superiour to him; and besides, the Glory which the Supreme God has in being the Supreme God, is incommunicable to whosoever is not of One and the Same Essence with him. Further, 'tis of mighty Consequence to observe, that these Ideas, *One with God, equal with God, to be God's own Son, and to be God*, are in the Stile of the Scripture very much the same; and therefore we may safely expound 'em by one another: For when Jesus Christ says before the Jews, that *He and the Father are One*, the Jews take up Stones and offer to stone him. And when the

the Saviour of the World asks them the Reason of this ill Treatment, they answer, *For a good Work we stone thee not, but because that thou, being a Man, makest thy self God.* You here see that they take for one and the same thing, *to be One with the Father, and to be God.* 'Tis also proper to observe, that they do not charge Jesus Christ with calling himself the Son of God in a Figurative Sense. They would never have made such a stir, if all the business had been about a Man that call'd himself the Son of God by a Metaphor, and Adoption. For in this Sense they pretended to be so themselves. *We have, say they, One Father, which is God.* No doubt they meant quite another thing from this, when they said, *We have one Law, and according to this Law, he ought to dye, for he hath made himself the Son of God.* They also explain themselves, and charge Jesus Christ with making himself equal and like to God. And indeed the Natural Idea of *own Son, only Son, and Son by Nature,* carries in it such a kind of Equality; as is an Equality of Essence and Nature; and we cannot conceive that Jesus Christ is begotten properly by the Eternal Father, without conceiving that the Eternal Father communicates to him his Substance; as in ordinary and natural Generations a Father communicates his Life and Substance to his Son. Now either God communicates all his Substance, or a part of his Substance. He cannot communicate to Jesus Christ a part of his Substance, because God's Substance is Indivisible. He must therefore communicate to him the whole; and consequently the Son must be of one and the same Essence, or of one and the same Substance with the Father. I know I shall be told, that these Ideas are literal; and I confess they are so: for we do not dispute here

X

about

about the Thing as it is in it self, but about the Thought which the Jews might have when they heard Jesus Christ call himself God's own and true Son. We must not, I say, be surpriz'd that the Jews, taking his Words in a literal Sense, should think that Jesus Christ made himself equal and like to God. And that which proves they were not mistaken in the Thought, is, that Jesus Christ takes no manner of care to undeceive 'em; neither does the Evangelist supply the Silence of Jesus Christ in this Case, as in the Case of the Temple, when he says, *that he spake of the Temple of his Body*, and in the Case of the Disciples, when deceiv'd by the ill Construction they put upon the Words of the Son of God, they believ'd that *John* would not dye. The Evangelist gives us not the least intimation that the Jews took the Words of Jesus Christ in an ill Sense: and yet this Silence were enough to betray us into Impiety and Idolatry.

'Tis true they here object to us, that Jesus Christ seems to answer this Objection, and to remove the Difficulty, when he tells the Jews, that since their own Law gave Men the Title of Gods, they ought not to be surpriz'd that he whom the Father had sanctified call'd himself the Son of God. For, first, our Adversaries themselves are forced to own, that Jesus Christ does not explain himself fully by this Answer. They all agree that Jesus Christ is God in a more eminent Sense than those of whom 'tis said, *Ye are Gods, but ye shall dye like Men*; and if any one should offer to prove that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God, but in the same Sense that those were call'd Gods, our Adversaries would be the first that would oppose this Conclusion. Further, 'tis proper to observe, that Jesus Christ answers those that speak to him

Three ways. He answers their Words, their Thoughts, or their Necessities. Of all which we can give Examples taken out of the Matter before us. He answers their Words, when he answers the Questions they put to him, and answers, for Instance, this Question, *Art thou the Son of God? I am.* He answers their Thoughts, as when he answers him that said to him, *Good Master, &c. Why callest thou me Good? There is but one Good, and that is God.* For as Jesus Christ knows whatsoever passes in the Heart of him that asks him a Question, he very well sees that this Man takes him only for a Rabbi, or a Doctor of the Law; and 'tis under this Notion that he refuses to be call'd Good. For at other times, when he is known to be what he is, he will not take it ill to be called Good, since he gives himself this Quality, when he says to us, *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in Heart: and ye shall find rest unto your Souls.* And lastly, he answers the Necessities of those that talk with him, when seeing that the Jews accus'd him of Blasphemy, because he call'd himself the Son of God, that is to say, as they understood him, God's own Son, or, as they explain themselves, *equal and like to him,* he makes no direct Answer to their Words, nor even to their Thoughts; he does not tell 'em they are mistaken in the Sense they give his Words; he does not declare to them whether he is, or is not, equal and like to God: but he answers their Necessities, and in some measure their Disposition. As it he had said, *You are very much offended, because I call'd my self the Son of God. If 'tis the Word that displeases you, you ought to know that in your Law mere Men are called Gods. But if 'tis the Thing, you ought to consider, that 'tis I whom the Father hath sanctified.* And since you

read the Prophets, you ought to know who this Son is whom the Father sanctifieth. In which appears the admirable Discretion of Jesus Christ, who, as he very well knows, that his Hour is not yet come, to suffer Death, does therefore give no direct answer to his Enemies Words, by telling 'em, 'Tis true, I am like to God, being very sensible that such an answer would have fill'd 'em with Fury. But what does he do? He sees they affect to shew their Zeal and Jealousie for the Law of Moses: and therefore sends 'em to this Law. And when they say, We have one Law, and according to this Law this Man ought to dye; because he hath made himself the Son of God: He answers, Go and consult your Law, and you'll find, that he whom the Father hath sanctified, deserves better to be call'd the Son of God, than those who were call'd Gods in your Law.

C H A P. V.

Wherein 'tis farther shew'd, that Jesus Christ has invested himself with the Characters of the Glory of the Supreme God.

AND here I cannot tell whether we may be allow'd a Digression; and yet 'tis so necessary that we cannot avoid it. There can be nothing more opposite than the Case of those Jews that accus'd Jesus Christ of Blasphemy, and of those other Jews that applauded *Herod*, saying to him, *It is the Voice of a God, and not of a Man.* And therefore, when we justify the one, we must of necessity condemn the other. The Former will not have Jesus Christ to make himself God, because he is a Man. And the

the Latter will not have *Herod* to speak as a Man, but attribute to him the Voice of a God. Now if Heaven condemns the Impiety of these, so far as to punish *Herod* in an exemplary manner for not having rejected their most blasphemous Applauses; it seems that it ought necessarily to approve the Language of the other, when they cannot bear that Jesus Christ, being a Man, should make himself equal and like to God: and if they mistake in taking his Words in an ill Sense, Jesus Christ ought to correct them, by giving them the true Explication of the Terms he uses. And if Jesus Christ refuses to correct them on their own account, he ought however to have done it for our sakes, that those who should read his Gospel might not conceive this Wicked Opinion, That he equall'd himself to the Supreme God. And if he was unwilling to explain himself more clearly, yet his Disciples ought to have shew'd us the plain Sense of his Words, when they reported 'em.

But this is so far from being done, that the Disciples of the Lord who knew these things; for 'tis from them that we have 'em, and who were not ignorant that Jesus Christ was condemn'd being accus'd of a design to abolish the Law of *Moses*, and of having blasphem'd the Sovereign Majesty of God, by making himself Equal and Like to God, clear him in the first respect, and leave us no manner of doubt in the Case, by shewing us distinctly in what Sence Jesus Christ has abolish'd the Law, and in what Sence he has fulfill'd it. But as for the latter, they do not only omit clearing him of the crime of Impiety, but seem to write afterwards purely to confirm this Accusation. For knowing what had pass'd, they give him such Titles after his Resurrection, as he never assum'd during his

Life. Is it not in effect to authorize the Reproach of the Jews, to declare, as St. Paul does, that *Jesus Christ thought it no robbery to be Equal with his Father?*

But that which is most surprizing, is, that to an Equality with God they add (if I may so say) an Identity with God, by saying so many things of Jesus Christ as were never said but of the Supreme God, and cannot be apply'd to any other without equal Extravagance and Impiety, as has been already observ'd.

But that we may not in the least doubt of it, we are to observe, that the Apostles call him God after all these invincible reasons to the contrary. *Hereby, saith St. John, perceive we the Love of God, because he laid down his Life for us.* The Name of God was not sufficient, but 'twas thought fit to exalt it by such Epithets as belong only to the Supreme God. He is therefore call'd *the true God, the great God, the most High, God over all things, the Lord,* (which is the Expression whereby the LXX render the most August Names of God) *the Lord of Glory, our Lord and our God, the Lord, the God of the Israelites, the King of Kings, and the Lord of Lords, He who was, who is, and who is to come.* And thus you see by what Titles the Apostles destroy the Suspicion or rather the formal and solemn Accusation drawn up against him in the Face of the whole World, viz. to have design'd to equal himself to the Supreme God.

As for the Name of *Lord*, 'tis agreed, that 'tis given to Jesus Christ, and 'tis also own'd that none but God the Father bears this Name with him in the Stile of the Holy Scriptures. And thus you unquestionably find a Name, that was given only to the Supreme Being, to be given to Jesus Christ, I say, *Lord*, without adding any thing

thing else ; which signifies *the Lord* by way of Excellence.

My Lord and my God is a Title given him by *Thomas* after his Resurrection : and we must not say with our Adversaries, that when *Thomas* speaks thus, he addresses himself by a kind of Apostrophe to the Eternal Father. 'Tis plain from the Gospel, that he speaks to Jesus Christ. For the Text says expressly : *He answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God ;* and the Pronoun which we translate *Him*, relates undoubtedly to Jesus Christ, who had spoke to him, and to whom *Thomas* answer'd.

The Lord of Glory may be consider'd as an Expression parallel to the Other. *The King of Glory*, is, in the Stile of the Prophets, a Title which belongs to the Supreme God. *The Lord of Glory*, and *the King of Glory*, make but the same Expression. And yet 'tis by this Title that the Apostles Characterise Jesus Christ. *Had they known* 1 Cor. 2. *it, they would not have crucifi'd the Lord of Glory, &c.* To which must be added the Title of *King of Kings* and *Lord of Lords*, which Jesus Christ is represented to us as having upon his Thigh. And this *King*, or this *Lord of Glory*, is *the Most High*, or *the Sovereign* of whom *Zacharias* speaks. *Thou shalt go before the Face of the Sovereign :* and He before whose Face *John* the Baptist went, is Jesus Christ.

This also shews us, that Jesus Christ is called in Scripture *the God of the Israelites*. For *Zacharias* continues his Prophecy thus : *And many of the Children of Israel shall be turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before him* (that is to say, before the Lord thier God) *in the Spirit and Power of Elias*. He then before whom *John* the Baptist was to go, is not only call'd *the most High God*, but is also call'd *the Lord their God, or the God*

of the Israelites. For 'tis of him that the Prophet was speaking.

Jesus Christ is call'd the true God. But we know, saith St. John, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and Eternal Life. We do not design to refute the interpretation of those who referr these words, *This is the true God*, to the Father, and not to the Son, because we have sufficiently refuted it by producing the words of the Text.

τὸ θεῶν
Θεὸς ὁ
σωτὴρ Ἰ.

He is call'd the Great God by St. Paul in his Epistle to Titus. For, saith he, the Grace of God which bringeth Salvation to all Men hath appeared; teaching us, that denying Ungodliness and worldly Lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present World, looking for that blessed Hope, and the glorious Appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. The Article which is put before the Great God, and belongs likewise to Saviour, is in the Original a certain Proof that both these Terms are understood of the same Person, and that 'tis Jesus Christ who is call'd Saviour and Great God both together. For the Epithet Great falls on the Term Saviour, as well as on the Term God; which is the reason why the Greek Article is put before the Epithet Great, and not before God, and thus is answer'd a small Objection in Grammar which our Adversaries make upon this account.

Jesus Christ is call'd God over all blessed for evermore. For, saith St. Paul, I could wish that my self were accursed from Christ, for my Brethren, my Kinsmen according to the Flesh; who are Israelites: to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promises; whose are the Fathers.

Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for evermore. It is easie to perceive the strong desire they had to elude the force of this Passage, because they have been so very bold to maintain, that these words, *who is God over all blessed for evermore*, referr'd to God the Father, tho' there is not so much as mention made of him in the Verses preceding which begin the Chapter thus: *I say the truth in Christ, &c.* and tho' 'tis plain, that *Christ* is the Noun to which the Pronoun *who* belongs.

C H A P. VI.

That the Christian Religion cannot be distinguished from Superstition, nor Fiction, nor from Magick it self, if Jesus Christ is not God blessed for evermore.

AND now 'tis no hard matter to make good of the Christian Religion, what we have already shew'd concerning the Jewish Religion: viz. that if the Principle of our Adversaries is suppos'd to be true, it can pass for nothing else but Idolatry and Superstition, for mere Comedy and Farce, design'd to play upon God, and to trick Mankind; and for a Familiarity with some Spirit of Darkness, which authoriz'd the Impiety and Blasphemy in it: which are extravagant and most horrid Ideas.

I say, that the Christian Religion would be real Idolatry. For wherein does Idolatry consist, but in confounding the Creature with the Creator? And what is confounding the Creature with the Creator, but investing the One with the

the most Peculiar and Essential Glory of the O-
ther?

Herod was accounted an Idolater for having only suffer'd the People to cry out, *'Tis the Voice of a God, &c.* from a certain Rapture of Admiration, which however did not hinder but they took him really for a Man. Those that cast a Grain of Incense before an Idol were guilty of Idolatry, tho' they did it with regret. One could not swear by the Emperor's Head, without being guilty of the same Crime, tho' no body imagin'd that the Emperour was a God for that. But it would have been the height of Idolatry to give him the Name of God, and to pay him Divine Honours, as upon some Occasions the *Romans* did. And why so? Because Idolatry does not only consist in giving the Creature whatsoever is given to the Creator, but purely in giving it any thing that is peculiar to him. But here the Sacred Writers do not only attribute to Jesus Christ a part of what belongs to the Supreme God, but they agree to attribute to him all the most peculiar and essential Characters of his most incommunicable Glory. They attribute to him the Works, and the greatest Works of God, his Power, Wisdom, Goodness, Eternity, &c. his Titles, Names, and Glory: and how is it possible to confound the Creature with the Creator better?

'Twill be no Answer to say, that tho' the Writers of the New Testament speak of Jesus Christ as of a Person that partakes, in some measure, of the Glory of the Deity, yet, that he might not be reasonably accus'd of having a design to confound himself with him, it sufficeth that Jesus Christ declares to us, that he is less than his Father. For this is utterly false. A Man, for Instance, that loves *Gold* and *Silver* immoderately,

says

says all his Life-time, that God is the chiefest Good, and to be valu'd above Riches, without preferring Riches evertheless to God, and therefore without deserving to be call'd evertheless an Idolater. A Man that should cause himself to be worshipt by attributing to himself all the Names and Titles of God, would for all that be an Idolater, tho' he acknowledg'd God to be Greater than He. Or, to chuse a Comparison of a commoner Use, a Man that should attribute to himself, without any more ado, all the *King's Works*, that should take all his Titles, and should moreover call himself the true King, the great King, the Sovereign, the Lord of the State, whom every thing Obeys, &c. that should cause himself to be intitled King, and should exact such Homages as were never given to any but to the said Monarch, such a Man would certainly be guilty of High-Treason, notwithstanding he happen'd onceto say, that the King is greater than He,

And this induces us to think, that, according to this Hypothesis, Religion would not be only Idolatry, but an impious Comedy or Farce design'd to play upon God, and to trick Mankind. For indeed it may be said, (which is such Blasphemy as I dread to utter) that Jesus Christ would appear in the Church much like a Player on the Stage, who takes all the Names and Titles of a King, attributes to himself his Works, and exacts his Homages, without being really what he appears to be to the Spectators Eyes; but yet there would be this difference between the one and the other; that whereas in acting on the Stage for the Diversion of the Publick, a Player that acts the part of a Prince and a Sovereign, does not pretend that the Play becomes a Reallity, nor that the Spectators should pay him Homages after the Representation,

nor

nor even that they should be really persuaded that he is King whilst the Play lasts, if he did he would hereby become worthy of the greatest Punishment; here, on the contrary, we should find a kind of Farce or Comedy, wherein a mere Man should call himself God, the true God, the great God, the mighty God, and should be worshipt in this Quality, without being really so, and without any acting on Mens part, who would seriously confound him with the Creator, and call him *Equal with the Father*, and *God over all blessed for ever*, being all seduced by the Apostles, who would be the first Authors of this dangerous and criminal Fiction.

It is certain that Religion is turn'd into Comedy, according to the *Hypothesis* of our Adversaries. There you find a God Representative, an imaginary Hell, (for where is Hell, if the Souls of the Wicked are, as they pretend, annihilated;) a Satisfaction that is only so in appearance, a Metaphorical Sacrifice, Artificial Threatnings, &c. But this Consideration does not belong to this Place.

But if here they say, that the Miracles which Jesus Christ wrought, are true Miracles, and not artificial Wonders, as are those that accompany the Representations of the Stage: they will remove this first thought from us only to give us another more horrid.

In effect, what are these Miracles which are wrought by one that attempted to seat himself on the Throne of the Deity? If Jesus Christ is an impious and sacrilegious Person, as without doubt he is, if he usurps the Glory of God, there's no more Humility, nor Justice, nor true Charity, nor Zeal, nor Piety, to be found in him. By this supposition all his Virtues are defac'd and eclips'd; and in their room should

be put Pride, Injustice, Sacrilege, Impiety and Seduction. Now as those Miracles that are accompany'd with Holiness are the Character of the Spirit of God's; so those Miracles that authorize Impiety can be look'd upon only as the Work of the Spirit of Darkness.

Here perhaps it will be said, that the Miracles of Jesus Christ appear to be Divine by their own Character; because they appear to be exalted above the Power of all the Creatures. But this will be no satisfactory Answer. The greatest thing that ever Jesus Christ did, was the raising of the Dead. And yet this Miracle, abstracted from his Holiness, would not be sufficient to persuade us that he had a Call from Heaven: and when we call to Mind the Witches bringing up *Samuel* out of his Grave, and her making him appear before *Saul*, by a Familiarity which she had with the Spirit of Darkness, we cannot believe that the raising a Dead Person is sufficient to convince us by its own Characters, and to overcome the Scandal which the Impiety of a Man that should usurp God's Glory, would give us. But let us not debauch our Paper any more with such horrid Suppositions. We have said enough to shew into what dreadful Abysses our Adversaries Principle leads us: and nothing, I think, is henceforward more evident, than that strict and essential Union which is between the Truth of the Christian Religion, and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is of One and the Same Essence with his Father. And this is the Grand Principle we design'd to prove. But it is not sufficient to have establish'd the Doctrine, except we answer the Objections that are made against it: and for this we design the sixth and last Section, which shall be a little longer than the foregoing.

S E C T.

S E C T. VI.

Wherein are answered the Principle Objections ; and an atttempt is made to satisfie our selves upon the Difficulties of this Great Mystery.

C H A P. I.

A Fundamental Rule in this Matter.

AFTER having establisht the Foundations of the Truth, it remains to answer the principal Objections which our Adversaries make us on this occasion. They are wont to take the Reasons they make use of to engage our Opinion with, from these three Heads, from Reason, the Analogy of Faith, and the Scripture, but in such an Order, that they lay more stress on the Arguments they take from the Principles of Reason, than on those they take from the Scripture. Which is what one of their most celebrated Teachers tells us in such a manner, that 'tis impossible to mistake his Mind.

Smalcus.

We do believe, saith he, that though we should find it in Scripture, not once or twice, but very frequently and plainly declared, that God was made Man, it were much better (in as much as this is an absurd

Propo-

Proposition, entirely contrary to right Reason, and full of Blasphemy towards God) to invent some way of speaking that might make it to be safely affirm'd of God, rather than to understand these things barely according to the Letter.

Which is as much as to say, that these Gentlemen do not regulate their Opinions by the Scripture, but the Scripture by their Opinions. But before we go any farther, it is very fit to set them right a little in this Point.

If the Reason of Man were not corrupted by Sin, he might reckon upon his Understanding, and be assur'd on some occasions that he should not be mistaken: but yet in this case he would have no reason to presume more on the Light of his Mind, than on the Light of Revelation; it being certain that his Knowledge is Finite, and that God's is not. What then shall we say, when on one hand his Understanding is Finite and bounded, and on the other the Corruption that is natural to him, and the necessary Commerce that is between his Thoughts and his Passions, fill his Mind with a thousand Prejudices which are so capable to disguise the Truth to him?

But if there were nothing else but such things as appear conformable to our Reason, which we were oblig'd to receive with Faith, we must presently reject all the Objects in general which the Apostles have propounded to us in their Gospel. For what efforts soever our Adversaries make to level the grand Difficulties of Religion, we shall always find unmeasurable Depths in it, whilst we offer to sound 'em with our Reason. This is none of our own Thought, but an Apostle's, who for this reason calls the Gospel a Foolishness. For, saith he, after that, in the Wisdom of God, the World by Wisdom knew

knew not God, it pleased God by the Foolishness of Preaching to save them that believe. And indeed if the Mysteries of Religion had nothing difficult and seemingly inexplicable in 'em, there would be no manner of difficulty in believing, and Faith would be no longer a Sacrifice offer'd to God. I say further still, that Faith would be no more a Gift of God, than the Perswasion which Men have of Natural Truths; and there would be no need for the Grace of the Holy Spirit to work more powerfully in us in order to incline us to believe, than to dispose us to understand the Problems of Geometry.

Further, Faith would be chang'd into Sight, contrary to the Apostle's Sentiment, who tells us: *We walk by Faith, and not by Sight.* For to perswade our selves of those things which are agreeable to our Reason, and not to be perswaded of 'em but when our Reason does not reject 'em, is not to Believe, but to See and Comprehend.

I cann't tell whether we would do less for God, than we do every day for an honest Man, whom we believe we should offend, if when speaking to us of some surprizing and extraordinary thing, he says to us, *Take my word for it, 'tis as I tell ye:* we should answer him, *We must consider of what you say. If 'tis agreeable to our Reason, we'll believe it: but if 'tis not, we won't believe a word on't.* But if this Language is abusive, even when 'tis directed to Men, who are not infallible in their Judgments: we ought to believe 'twould be Impious and full of Blasphemy, if 'twere directed to God, who is equally incapable of deceiving Us, and of being deceiv'd Himself.

'Tis here objected, that all Divines have us'd the same Prudence in matters of less importance, and which prejudic'd (much less) the Glory of God, to understand not according to the Letter, but in an im-

proper and figurative Sense, those places of Scripture which might seem to offend the Divine Majesty; as those Passages of Scripture which say, either that God came down, or that God was wroth. To which they add the Passages that attribute to God the Parts of a Humane Body. But here our Adversaries commit several acts of Injustice.

First, it cannot be said, that what we believe concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation offends the Divine Majesty more than the Opinion of the *Anthropomorphites*, since we cannot attribute to God the Parts of a Humane Body, without conceiving bounds, imperfection and also change in him: whereas the Union of the Divine Nature with the Humane Nature does very well suppose a Holy and Happy Change in the Humane Nature of Jesus Christ, but it makes no alteration in the Divine Essence, which remains as perfect as it was before. Moreover, we cannot find that the Expressions of Scripture taken in their most natural sense, and compar'd with one another, do impose on us a necessity of being *Anthropomorphites*, nor to attribute our weaknesses and irregularities to God; since Nature and Reason do not say louder than the Scripture, that *God is Unchangeable*; that *he filleth the Heavens*; that the *Heavens of Heavens cannot contain him*; that *there is no Variableness with him*; that *he is not like to a Man, nor to any of the Creatures which he has made*; that *God is a Spirit*.

But if Reason were permitted to be the Rule of Faith, 'twould be the occasion of dreadful Inconveniency. First, Faith and Revelation would become good for nothing. For what would it signifie for God to have made known his Counsel to us, if Reason were allow'd to say, This is not the Counsel of God. It cannot be, for I don't comprehend it; and then Conscience

must take for its Rule, not Revelation, but the Doubt which the Mind had rais'd upon Revelation? Besides, 'twould be impossible to scatter the Darknes which Sin has spread over our Understanding. For how is it possible to rectifie a Reason that's proud of its own Light, and is resolv'd to regulate Revelation by its Prejudices, and not its Prejudices by Revelation? In short, Faith would be a preferring our own Light to the Light of God, and not a preferring the Light of God to our Own, for instead of saying, I believe *that*, as incredible soever as 'tis, because God has reveal'd it to me, we should say, I won't believe it, tho' God has reveal'd it to me, and as plain soever as his Revelation is, because it appears incredible to me. Divine Faith would have no advantage over Humane Faith: on the contrary, the latter would have a great deal over the former; because we should not be so submissive to God, as to our Parents, Masters, and Tutors, who make us receive in the Civil Life an infinite number of Truths by their bare Authority. And Faith would also do very well without Humility and Submission of Heart. For what need is there of submitting and humbling our selves, when we have nothing else to do but to convince our selves of the Truths that by their own Characters are persuasive, and to embrace them only in proportion to the agreement they have with our own Natural Light?

'Twill be to no purpose to object, that Reason is as the Foundation of Faith; and consequently Faith cannot be more certain than Reason. I confess that Reason leads to Revelation, because it convinces us that God is intallible, and that we are not; and consequently we cannot do better than to guide our selves by his Light, and to prefer it before the idle conjectures of our mind

but in that, Reason leads us to this infallible Authority, it hereby commands us to receive with Submission whatsoever this Authority propounds clearly to us.

In effect, we may distinguish *Three Things* in Faith : The *Principle* or Fundamental Maxim of Faith, *Discretion* of Faith, and the *Conclusion* of Faith. I call the *Principle* of Faith, this first Maxim, without which 'twere impossible for Faith to be ingendred in us, I mean this first Notion in Religion, *Whatever God saith is true*. I call the *Discretion* of Faith, that Examination of our Mind, whereby we assure ourselves, first, whether 'tis God that speaks, and, secondly, what the Things are he says to us. Lastly, the *Conclusion* of Faith, is that Assent which we give to a Truth, both because we have found that 'twas reveal'd by God, and because we have suppos'd that whatsoever God says to us is True.

Which being thus suppos'd, I readily grant, that Reason leads us to receive what we call'd the Principle of Faith. 'Tis by the purest Light of Common Sense that we are perswaded that whatever God says to us is True. I also own, that 'tis our Reason which makes the *Discretion* of Faith ; because 'tis that, that is impress'd upon by the Characters of Divinity, which are in Revelation ; and that afterwards searches whether such or such a Doctrine is contain'd in Revelation, by Examining and Comparing of those Passages which should contain it. But this is All ; and Reason must acquiesce in what God tells it, without offering to stand up for judge of the Truth of his words, when it has once found out the sense of 'em. The contrary Disposition is no Divine Faith, but an unsufferable Temerity of a sort of Reason that would be independant upon God. This Language then of *Smalcus* is plain Blasphemy :

my : Tho' we should find it in Scripture not once or twice, but very frequently and very plainly written, that God was made Man : 'twere much better, (in as much as this is an absurd Proposition, contrary to right Reason, and full of Blasphemy) to invent, &c. And to rectifie it, we must say : Tho' this Proposition, God was made Man, appear'd to us a thousand times more absurd and more contrary to right Reason, yet we ought to be perswaded that our Reason deceives us, and that this Truth is certain, because 'tis contain'd in the Word of God.

Of these Two Languages the First is bold, presumptuous, and includes in it a visible preference of the Eyes of our Understanding to the clear Ideas of Revelation : which is directly contrary to the Nature of true Faith. The Last is, on the contrary, humble, reasonable, and includes in it a manifest preference of the clear Ideas of the Scripture to the Eyes of our Understanding : which is such a Disposition as makes, as it were, the Life and Essence of Faith.

After we have establisht this Foundation, we shall pass to the consideration of those Objections which our Adversaries make us upon the Grand Mystery of the Trinity.

C H A P. II.

Wherein is answer'd the first and most considerable Objection of our Adversaries, taken from the Silence of the Scripture.

AND here, we shall not weaken our Adversaries Arguments by producing 'em: But shall make use of their own Words as much as possibly we can; and if, for Brevity's sake, we sometimes abridge 'em, their Objections will be rather the stronger for it.

The Argument then which appears to us to be the first in Order, and is without doubt one of the most probable, is that which they take from the pretended Silence of the Scripture in the Mystery of the Incarnation.

" We see, say they, that those things which
 " are on one hand a little difficult to be believ'd,
 " and on the other are absolutely necessary to Sal-
 " vation, are very frequently and very clearly ex-
 " plain'd in the Scriptures: such are the Creation
 " of Heaven and Earth, the Care which God takes
 " of Humane Affairs, the Knowledge of our
 " Thoughts, the Resurrection of the Dead, and E-
 " ternal Life, which God has promis'd us. And they
 " are not only things absolutely necessary, which
 " we find very distinctly and very clearly set
 " down in Scripture, but also such as are of a
 " lesser importance, as is this Truth, that *Jesus*
 " *Christ is of the Seed of David*. Now, if the Incar-
 " nation of the Supreme God were true, 'twould
 " be on one hand an Article of Faith absolutely
 " necessary, and on the other very difficult to
 " be believ'd, &c. And therefore it ought to
 " have been very clearly set down in the Scrip-
 " ture,

" ture, and so often inculcated and repeated by
 " the Holy Men who design'd to take care of
 " our Salvation, that no Body might doubt but it
 " made a part of their Revelation. And yet
 " it appears to us that there is no such thing:
 " because, First, the Passages which our Adversa-
 " ries produce to prove their Tenet, are of such
 " a Nature, that they must be forc'd to draw
 " several Consequences to broach this Tenet,
 " *that the most high God was incarnate, or that he*
 " *was made Man*: And, Secondly, because this
 " Incarnation is not set down in the places
 " where it should be, supposing it were true.
 " For when *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke* write
 " the History of Jesus Christ's Birth, and relate
 " some things which are of a lesser importance
 " than this Incarnation of the Supreme God, as
 " that Christ was born of a Virgin who was
 " espous'd to a Man; that he was conceiv'd by
 " the Holy Ghost; that he was born at *Bethle-*
 " *hem*; to say nothing of some other things
 " which *St. Matthew* had omitted, and *St. Luke*
 " has exactly set down: how is it possible they
 " should pass over in silence the greatest and
 " most considerable thing in it all, and the
 " most necessary to be believ'd and known, *viz.*
 " that the Most High God descended into the
 " Womb of a Virgin, there took Flesh, and was
 " afterwards born? *St. Luke* has not omitted
 " the *Manger*, wherein Jesus Christ was laid af-
 " ter his Birth; and yet has forgotten the In-
 " carnation of the Supreme God, and the Hy-
 " postatic Union of the Humane Nature with
 " the Divine Nature. How could it be possible
 " further, that *St. Mark* should forget the whole
 " History of Jesus Christ's Birth which should take
 " in the Incarnation; and *St. John*, whom they
 " will have to speak of it, should pass so slightly
 " over

“ over it, and speak of it with so much Obscuri-
 “ ty? How come the Apostles to make no men-
 “ tion of so important a Doctrine, when they
 “ brought Men over to Jesus Christ, and exhort-
 “ ed them to believe on him, and upon this ac-
 “ count set his Majesty before their Eyes?
 “ Read the first Sermon that St. Peter made to
 “ the People after he had receiv’d the Holy
 “ Ghost, the Success whereof was so great, that
 “ about Three Thousand Souls believed on Jesus
 “ Christ, and were baptiz’d; and his second
 “ Exhortation to the People: and you’ll find
 “ that he makes not the least mention of the
 “ Incarnation in either. Neither will you find
 “ it in any of this Apostle’s Discourses con-
 “ cerning Jesus Christ, whether to the Chief
 “ Rulers and Elders of the People, or to Corne-
 “ lius, or others. St. Paul says nothing of it in
 “ his Discourses in the Synagoue, at *Antioch* in
 “ *Areopagus*, at *Athens*, and before *Felix* and *A-*
 “ *grippa* at *Cesarea*: And certainly he met with
 “ a very fine and very favourable opportunity at
 “ *Athens* to explain this Mystery, when he talk-
 “ ed with the *Athenians* about the unknown
 “ God, &c.

This Objection deserves that we should make
 several Reflexions on the Procedure of our Ad-
 versaries. First, it looks exceeding awkward,
 that they who have so little respect for the
 Holy Scripture, should make use of its silence
 against us. One while they declare, that tho’
 the Holy Scripture should say expressly, and re-
 peat it very frequently, *that God was made Man*,
 they would not believe it for all that: and ano-
 ther while they dispute against us from the Si-
 lence of the Scripture.

Further, the Objection runs upon a very E-
 quivocal Maxim. It supposes, that when Truths

are on one hand difficult to be believ'd, and on the other exceeding necessary, they are very frequently repeated and very expressly set down in the Scripture. But if they understand it of every Book of the Scripture, the Maxim is false; and if they understand it of the Body of the Scriptures, this way of reasoning is useless; because we maintain that the Mystery of the Incarnation is most expressly set down in the Body of the Scripture. The Maxim taken in the first Sense is so false, that we need no other Examples than those contain'd in the Objection to destroy it. The Resurrection of the Dead and Eternal Life, which have been so expressly reveal'd in the Gospel, are not set down so frequently, or so clearly in the Books of the Old Testament. The Creation and the Conduct of Divine Providence, which are so clearly reveal'd in the Old Testament, are on the contrary suppos'd and rarely express'd in the Books of the New. And thus they would have done well to have removed Equivocation, before they had made an Argument of this Principle against us. As for the rest, there is no likelihood that our Adversaries Sense is, that an Essential and Important Truth ought to be contain'd in all the Books of the Scripture, or even in all the parts of the New Testament. For this is neither possible nor necessary. It is not *necessary*; because as the Holy Ghost has given us for the Rule of our Faith, not one certain Book of the Scripture, but the whole Body of the Scriptures, it sufficeth that the Essential and Necessary Doctrines are found contain'd in the Body of the Revelation, without its being necessary that they should be included in every Book. And then 'tis not *possible*; because in the Scripture there are several Discourses, and also Epistles and Books too much

abridg'd

abridg'd to contain all that's necessary to be known or believ'd, or at least to contain with any clearness or tolerable order.

We must observe in the third place, that the Objection supposes that a Truth is not clearly contain'd in the Scripture, when it must be drawn out of it by Consequences. *And yet it appears to us, saith our Author, that there is no such thing : Because, First, the Passages quoted by our Adversaries to prove their Tenet, are of such a Nature, that the Doctrine of the Incarnation cannot be drawn from thence but by force of Consequences.* But this Author is mightily out, if he thinks that the Scripture does not say clearly what may be inferr'd from thence by just and reasonable Conclusions, and we can prove his mistake from the Authority of our Saviour Jesus Christ; who endeavouring to prove the Immortality of the Soul out of the Books of *Moses*, because the *Sadducees* against whom he disputed acknowledged no other, quotes these Words of God to *Moses, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*, though the Immortality of the Soul was not contain'd in these Words in express and formal Terms, but was only inferr'd from thence consequentially.

We must not omit, in the fourth place, that the Author of the Objection is mistaken, when he pretends that these Truths, that Jesus Christ was born of a Virgin, that he was conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost, are of a lesser importance than the Truth of the Incarnation. We readily grant, that the Incarnation is a greater Mystery than Jesus Christ's Conception by the Holy Ghost: But we do not say, that the latter is less necessary to be believ'd than the former. It is so necessary to know that Jesus Christ came not into the World by ordinary means,

means, that without it we cannot be assur'd either of the Mystery of the Incarnation, or of the Benefits and Fruits of Jesus Christ's Death: It being certain, that if the Humane Nature of Jesus Christ had not been sanctified from his very Conception, it could neither be united to a most Holy Essence, as is God's, nor suffer a Death capable of taking away the Sins of Mankind. Which Consideration will be of great use hereafter.

'Twill give us occasion, in the fifth place, to retort upon our Adversaries with Advantage whatever they say concerning the Silence of the Scripture upon the Mystery of the Incarnation: and to shew 'em that there is no manner of sound Reason in whatever they say on this account, I need only convince 'em that their Argument proves too much, and that the same Silence of the Scripture which they object against the Incarnation, *we* may object our selves, and that more forcibly, against the Conception of Jesus Christ by the Power of the Holy Ghost, and his Birth of a Virgin. This last Doctrine is Essential and Necessary, by the Confession of the whole World; and our Adversaries can no more dispute it than we, because 'tis the Conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost which they pretend to be the first Foundation on which is establish'd the Title of *the only Son of God*, and they also own that if Jesus Christ were not born of a Virgin, the Oracles of the Prophets would not have been accomplish'd. And this so necessary Doctrine is besides very difficult to be believ'd, in that there was never any thing more surprizing in the World, than to see a Man born of a Virgin. Let our Adversaries then put the same Questions to themselves upon the miraculous Conception and Birth

Birth of Jesus Christ, which they put just now upon his Incarnation, or let 'em give us leave to put 'em for 'em. How is it possible that St. Mark should forget to give us the History of 'em? Why does not St. John mention 'em? How come the Apostles to say nothing of so important a Matter, when they bring Men over to Jesus Christ? Read but St. Peter's first Sermon to the People after he had received the Holy Ghost, and you will find there is no more mention made of his miraculous Conception and Birth, than of the Mystery of the Incarnation. As little mention is made of 'em in the same Apostle's second Discourse after he had healed the lame Man who lay at the Gate of the Temple which was called *Beautiful*. St. Peter speaks afterwards of Jesus Christ to the Chief Rulers and Elders of the People, to *Cornelius* and others; but never speaks to them of the Miracles of his Conception and Birth. St. Paul says nothing of 'em in his Discourses in the Synagogue at *Antioch*, in *Areopagus* at *Athens*, and before *Felix* and *Agrippa*. Shall we therefore conclude from hence, that the miraculous Conception and Birth of Jesus Christ make not an Essential and Fundamental Article of the Christian Doctrine? Our Adversaries will judge of it themselves. Yes, they'll say, but St. Matthew and St. Luke are not silent in this matter, if others are. They inform us, that Jesus Christ was conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost, and was born of a Virgin. I grant it: but then again we don't say, that all the Sacred Writers are silent concerning the Truth of the Incarnation, for we quote the express Words of the Holy Ghost, who tells us, that Jesus Christ is *Emanuel*, *God with us*; that the *Mystery of Godliness is Great*, *God manifested in the Flesh*; that the *Word was God*, and that *this Word was made*

made Flesh. And now to what purpose is this Enumeration which the Author of the Objection has made with so much Art, if he design'd hereby to tell us, that because the Incarnation is not in the Passages he has cited, therefore it is to be found no where in the Scripture. We shall only tell him, that he concludes from an imperfect Enumeration of Parts. For, is it not plain, that he has not taken into his List that celebrated Description which the Apostle makes of the Doctrine of Godliness, *Now without Controversy great is the,* &c. nor the beginning of St. John's Gospel, nor several other places of Scripture which we produce to prove our Sentiment? But if he design'd only to collect the occasions on which he fancies that for the Glory of Jesus Christ the Holy Men should have mention'd his Incarnation: I ask him, in my turn, why upon these same Occasions they don't mention his miraculous Conception, and Birth of a Virgin? For if Jesus Christ is by the Miracle of his Incarnation God blessed for ever, according to our Principles; Jesus Christ is the Son of God by the Miracle of his Conception, according to the Principles of our Adversaries.

We must add a sixth Consideration to the foregoing, to shew how dangerous it would be to follow the Method of the Author of the Objection. The perfect Holiness of Jesus Christ, by Virtue of which he committed no Sin, and never offended God either in Thought, Word, or Deed, is a Doctrine that is very true on one hand, as appears from this Oracle of *Esaïas*, *He had done no Violence, neither was any Deceit in his Mouth*; and very important on the other, for the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* makes our whole comfort to depend upon it, when

when he says : *For such an High-Priest became us, who is Holy, Harmless, Undeiled, separate from Sinners, and made higher than the Heavens, who needeth not daily (as those High-Priests) to offer up Sacrifice, first for his own Sins, and then for the Peoples, &c.* And yet if you look into the Gospels, you'll there find nothing but a profound Silence of the Holy Ghost in this matter, or at least you'll not be able to draw this Truth from thence but by mere Conclusions. You'll wonder that Jesus Christ seems to refuse the Title of *Good*, when he tells the Young Man that came to consult him, *There is none Good except God.* Indeed you'll there find that the Lord does on several Occasions give himself this Testimony : *I am the Light of the World. He that followeth me, shall not walk in Darkness, but shall have the Light of Life :* but we must reason to know, whether 'tis the Light of Holiness that is meant in this place, or meerly the Light of Truth. You'll hear Jesus Christ saying of himself, *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in Heart ; and ye shall find rest unto your Souls.* But you must draw Conclusions, to know whether this Meekness and this Lowliness are accompany'd in Jesus Christ with all other Virtues, and whether these Virtues are in a perfect Degree. There you'll hear Jesus Christ speak after this manner : *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that committeth Sin, is the Servant of Sin. And the Servant abideth not in the House for ever : but the Son abideth for ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* And in another place, *Who is he that convinceth me of Sin ? And if I speak the Truth, why do ye not believe me ?* I confess that this passage will give us to understand that Jesus Christ is exalted above the condition of Sinning Men : but you will not there find

find in plain and exprefs terms, that Jesus Christ is without Sin. From whence I conclude, that it is not neceffary that the moft important Truths fhould be contain'd in exprefs and formal Terms in the Scripture, and that it fufficeth to infer 'em by juft and reasonable Confequents. For tho' we had not the Epiftle to the *Hebrews*, or had never heard that thefe words in the 53. of *Ifaiah*, *He had done no Violence, neither was there any Deceit in his Mouth*, are to be referr'd to Jesus Christ, we fhould be nevertheless affur'd, that Jesus Christ was perfectly Holy and Righteous and fhould know it very well, both by the Analogy of Faith, and by an infinite number of Paflages in Scripture, from whence we fhould draw this Confequence. From hence alfo it appears, that it is not neceffary that One Truth, tho' Great and Important, fhould be fet down in every Page of the Scripture. Indeed the whole Oeconomy of our Salvation depends Effenentially on the Holinefs of Jesus Christ, and the Perfection of that Holinefs. And yet you may read a good part of the Scripture, and not find it.

But to answer more directly, I fay, It often happens, that the Sacred Writers keep a Myfterious Silence upon the more important matters and we may attribute this Silence to fundry Caufes. Sometimes to the Nature of the Covenant and Oeconomy. It was not convenient for instance, that *Mofes* and the Prophets fhould fpeak fo clearly of the Life to come as Jesus Christ; becaufe the Clearnefs of Revelation in this refpect was to make one of the moft unquestionable Characters of the Calling of the Meffias and Life and Immortality was to be reveal'd in Jesus Christ our Saviour. Neither was it fit that Jesus Christ fhould fpeak fo clearly of the Spirituality of his Kingdom, and the Myfteries

of the Kingdom of Heaven, before his Ascension, as he did afterwards, by his Spirit and the Ministry of his Disciples, whom he was to lead into all Truth. Sometimes we must attribute this Silence to this ; that the Holy Ghost following the most rational Method, makes use of the clearest and easiest things to lead us into the most abstruse and difficult things. The things which the Apostles are to declare, are of Two Sorts ; Facts, and Mysteries. The former are palpable and sensible ; and the latter abstract and Spiritual. 'Twere a prodigious Extravagance, to offer to recommend matters of Fact by first recommending Mysteries : both Nature and Reason require, on the contrary, that Mysteries should be recommended by recommending first Matters of Fact. We must not therefore be surpriz'd if the Apostles begin their Discourses and Epistles thus : *That which we have seen with our Eyes, which we have heard with our Ears and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life, declare we unto you.* If there were only Matters of Fact to be propounded to our Faith, the Holy Ghost would be content to give us the Four Gospels, which are properly the History of such Matters of Fact as are necessary to our Salvation : but because in the Doctrine of Salvation there are, besides, some Mysteries, the Holy Ghost has inspir'd the Doctrinal Writers of the New Testament in order to give us an exact knowledge of 'em. And if so, is it such a strange thing, that the first time St. Peter speaks in publick after he had receiv'd the Holy Ghost, he entertains the People with this Divine Effusion, of which the effects were so sensible, and quotes the Oracle in Joel which had foretold it ? That, after he had made a lame Man to walk, who lay at the Gate of the Temple which was called *Beautiful*,
perceiving

perceiving the astonishment of the People, he takes occasion from thence to speak to 'em of the Resurrection of the Saviour, in whose Name he wrought this great Miracle, and to insist on the Circumstances of the Life, Death and Resurrection of that Divine Crucifi'd Person, which were the most proper to subdue their Hardness of Heart? And is it such a mighty Wonder that St. Paul upon occasion does so too? Lastly, we ought very often to attribute this Silence to the Marvelous Condescension of God towards us, and his Design to proportion his Instructions to our Capacity. Which is what the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* gives us excellently well to understand, when he tells those to whom he writes: *Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God, and are become such as have need of Milk, and not of strong Meat. For every one that useth Milk, is unskilful in the word of Righteousness: for he is a Babe. But strong Meat belongeth to them that are of full Age, even those, who by reason of Use, have their Sences exercised to discern both Good and Evil.* Do not these words justify the Conduct of St. Peter and other Apostles, when speaking either to Men that were not yet converted, or to *Profelytes* whose Eyes were but just open'd to the Light of the Gospel, they treat 'em as Babes rather than as grown Men, teaching 'em the most sensible things, and reserving the most abstruse 'till another time?

But these are not all the Faults that we can find in this Objection. The Principal is, that this Objection is grounded on a Falsity advanced with too much Confidence, *viz.* that the Scripture is ordinarily silent as to the Mystery

of the Incarnation. Which is so far from being true, that there is no remarkable Occasion to make known to us this great Mystery, but the Holy Ghost makes use of it. Jesus Christ is at his *Birth* call'd *Emanuel, God with us*. At his *Baptism* he is Glorify'd in such a manner as cannot agree to a Creature; because a Creature cannot do the good pleasure of God; and the Good of the Creatures is not in the Creature's Power. When the Evangelists describe his Actions, they attribute to him all the Names, Perfections, Works, Homages and Glory of God. And the Apostles in their Additions to the Evangelists, give him the Title of having created Things Visible, and Invisible, of being the Beginning and the End of all Things, of having laid the Foundation of Heaven and Earth, and of being one day to destroy them both; of being One with God, and the same with the Almighty God, as has been shew'd at large in the preceding Sections.

They say, that the Passages we produce to prove our Doctrine are such, that we are forc'd to draw several Conclusions before they can serve our turn. And tho' it were so, there would be no inconvenience in it: but 'tis false. Jesus Christ is *God Manifested in the Flesh, the Word is God, and this Word was made Flesh*: we need only take the natural Sence of the words without any further reasoning, to find the Incarnation. For the Term *Flesh* is taken either for the *Body*; which Signification can have no Place here, because Jesus Christ did not only assume a Body, but as Body united to a Spirit: or it signifies *Sin*; which agrees much less to Jesus Christ, who did not assume a sinful but an innocent Nature: or lastly, this Term is taken for the *Humane Nature*. It remains then, that the last

Signification belongs to this place, and that the Sence is this : *God was Manifested in the Humane Nature.* If we must reason, we do it only for the Sence of the Terms, and not to infer from the Scripture by any consequence, a Truth that lay conceal'd. That God was made Man, or that God was manifested in the Humane Nature, is much one and the same Expression.

C H A P. III.

Wherein is answer'd an Objection taken out of the 17th. Chap. of St. John's Gospel : This is Life Eternal, &c.

ONE of the Principal Foundations of the Socinian Doctrine is that celebrated Passage in the 17. Chap. of the Gospel according to St. John, in these words : *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. No body questions, say our Adversaries, but that by the true God in this place must be understood the Supreme God. Therefore when Jesus Christ represents his Father to us as being the only true God, it follows, that none but the Father is the Supreme God. These are Crellius's Words.*

Before we answer directly to this Difficulty, 'twill be proper to make some general Remarks, which may serve to explain a little what we have to say on this Occasion. The First Remark we make is this, that as Jesus Christ may be consider'd in Two very different Estates, viz. the Estate of his Humiliation, and the Estate of his Glory, he is variously represented to us according

according as he is found in these two different Conditions. In the Estate of his Humiliation he assumes such Names as express his Abasement: But in the Estate of his Glory he assumes others that denote his Exaltation. In the first of these Estates he calls himself the Son of Man oftner than the Son of God: but after that he was glorified, the Disciples constantly call him the Son of God, and never the Son of Man. Before his Resurrection the Disciples think they say a great deal by making this Confession of him, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God*: But their Revelation encreasing with his Glory, they say to him, when they see him risen, *My Lord, and my God*! Thus when Jesus Christ teaches his Disciples to pray, he gives 'em an admirable Pattern of their Petitions in that most perfect Prayer, which we call the *Lord's Prayer*. And yet in this excellent Prayer there is not so much as mention made of Jesus Christ. But when Jesus Christ is just upon leaving the World, and is going to be glorified, then he begins to discourse his Disciples in this manner: *Verily, I say unto you, that whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, ye shall have it*. And lastly, after his Exaltation the Church placeth her Hope only in his Intercession, and offereth her Prayers and Praises to God only by the Hands of this Divine Saviour. *Blessed be the God and Father of Jesus Christ. Glory be to God through Jesus Christ*. If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous. And if so, we ought not to wonder that when Jesus Christ is speaking of himself, he speaks modestly and suitably to his present Condition; nor that in the Gospel the Father is oftner call'd God, than Jesus Christ; nor lastly, that on several Occasions Jesus Christ

speaks as if he were not the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and the Sovereign Manager of all Events.

The Arguments they take from the Silence of the Scripture, are sometimes extraordinary, but sometimes also they are very false. Will they say, for instance, that Jesus Christ is not our Mediator, because when he is on the Holy Mount with the Multitude, he teaches the Multitude and the Disciples the Duties of Morality, and takes notice of the Corruption of the Morality of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, without speaking to 'em simply of his Mediation? Will they say, that Jesus Christ is not our Intercessor with God, because when Jesus Christ is teaching his Disciples to pray, he does not teach them to beg of God the Graces they stand in need of, in the Name of Jesus Christ? Will they say, that Baptizing in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy, is no lawful Baptism, because that during Jesus Christ's Conversation on Earth, and before his Death, he neither baptiz'd himself, nor caus'd his Disciples to baptize after this manner? *Crellius* then has no reason to observe, that on several different Occasions, when Jesus Christ is speaking of himself, or the Apostles are speaking of Jesus Christ, they say nothing greater or higher than that he is the Son of God. For as there were several Occasions on which Jesus Christ spoke of himself as a mere Man, and others again, on which he spoke of himself as a mere Prophet, without making any mention of his Mediation, Intercession, Priesthood, and other Offices, and yet we cannot without Extravagance conclude from thence, that Jesus Christ was not our Intercessor, our High-Priest, and the Mediator between God and Men: So

Jesus

Jesus Christ and the Apostles might speak to us of Jesus Christ as a Priest, as a Mediator, as a King, as the Son of God, on certain Occasions, without speaking to us of his Divinity.

From this general remark I come to the Objection it self, and observe, that if our Adversaries would shew that Jesus Christ is not God, they act contrary to themselves. For they acknowledge that Jesus Christ bears this Name in Scripture. If they would prove that Jesus Christ is not the true God, they contradict themselves. *'Tis very false, says Socinus, that we should openly declare that Jesus Christ is not true God. We profess to say the contrary, and we declare that Jesus Christ is true God in several of our Writings, as well in the Latin as in the Polish Tongue. Jesus Christ, says Smalcus, may be called with a Sovereign right our God, and the true God, and he is really so. The same Author assures us in another place, that Jesus Christ is God in a most Excellent or Perfect manner, Perfectissimo modo.* Socin. ad Wick. p. 49.

If Jesus Christ is God, the true God, God by way of Excellence, or in a most perfect manner, (for both these Expressions are Equivalent) and if this is the Sentiment of our Adversaries, what do they mean by quoting this Passage? Certainly, all they can conclude from Jesus Christ's Words in St. John in the greatest rigour, is that Jesus Christ is not the true God, but that this Title belongs only to the Father. But this Conclusion, as advantageously as they can possibly draw it from thence, is contradictory to their own Sentiments, or at least to their own Words. Let them therefore first agree with themselves, and we'll see afterwards if we can agree with them too. But

we must say something to 'em more particularly.

St. *Paul* declares in some part or other of his Epistles, that *he determines to know nothing, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.* 'Tis certain, that if we only consider the force of the Terms, the Apostle excludes all other Objects of the Doctrine of Salvation, except Jesus Christ, and him crucified: but will they say, that it follows from thence, that the Father, as well as the rest, are excluded from this Object which St. *Paul* determines only to know? No, doubtless. We except, first, the Father, because we find in other places of Scripture that the Knowledge of the Father is necessary to obtain Eternal Life. If we take this Passage, *I determine to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified,* vigorously and in the utmost strictness of the proper Sense, 'twould be diametrically opposite to this other, *This is Eternal Life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* For one says, that we must propose to our selves nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified, as the Object of the Doctrine of Salvation; and the other teaches us, that to obtain Eternal Life, we must likewise know the Father. And therefore as these two Passages, if taken rigorously, cannot be both true, they are reconciled by saying, that when St. *Paul* determines to know Jesus Christ, and him crucified, he does not mean to exclude the Father, who being one with the Son, is known at the same time that he is. And if our Adversaries themselves follow this Method, when these two Passages of Scripture are to be reconcil'd, why will they not still keep to it, when we are to reconcile this Passage, which signifies in their Sense, that *the Father alone is the true God*; and those

those other Passages of Scripture which have taught 'em that *Jesus Christ is also the true God*? Methinks our Pretension in this respect cannot be more reasonable, nor better grounded. When St. Paul tells us, that *he determines to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified*, we except the Father, because we are taught by another Passage of Scripture, that Eternal Life consists not only in knowing Jesus Christ, but also in knowing the Father. And is it not likewise reasonable, that when the Scripture calls the Father the only true God, we should except Jesus Christ, since there are other Passages of Scripture which do certainly, and even by our Adversaries Confession, inform us, that Jesus Christ is also the true God?

CHAP. IV.

Wherein the same Objection is further answered.

TIS very remarkable that our Adversaries, and I mean the most ingenious among em, when they are handling this Argument, deprive themselves of all the Advantage they can gain by it, by the very Concessions they make us. *Crellius* owns, in the first place, that Jesus Christ utter'd these Words, *This is Eternal Life, to know thee the only true God, &c.* upon occasion of the Gods of the Gentiles, which were only false Gods and vain Idols. *The de-Deo* sign of Jesus Christ, saith he, *was not to deny that uno Patre.* the Idols or Gods of the Heathens were really Idols, *Señ. 1.* or Gods of the Heathens; but only to deny that they *Cap. 1.* *p. 15.* were

Ibidem
p. 19.

were the true God. He owns, in the second place, that if we consider the Construction of the Words, we must not join the Pronoun *Only* with *Thee Father*. Wherefore, saith he, we would not have any one charge us with thinking, that to have respect only to the Gramatical Construction of the Words, the Term *Only* ought to be join'd with this, *Thee (or thee Father) &c.* for the Article before the Pronoun *Only* will not bear it; and therefore we must understand the Verb to be. For otherwise 'twere as if Jesus Christ had said, to know that thou only art the true God: which though it be true in it self, is very far from the Sense of this Passage, as shall be shew'd by and by.

These Two Concession of a Man that holds the first Rank among our Adversaries, are very considerable, because they are sufficient to decide the Question in our favour. For when we quote a Passage of Scripture to prove any thing, we reason either from the bare force of the Words, or from the occasion on which they were utter'd. If we here dispute from the occasion of the Words, our Adversaries will prove nothing against us; for they agree, that Jesus Christ in this place opposes the true God to the false Divinities of the Heathens: which, to go no further, very well excludes Idols, but not Jesus Christ. If we consider the force of the Words, they can gain no advantage by that neither, because they cannot infer from thence that the Father only, and exclusively of Jesus Christ, is the true God, except the Pronoun *Only* be join'd with *thee Father*. But this is what *Crellius* declares they do not pretend.

But we need not be beholding to our Adversaries for any thing. I say then, in the third place, that they can gain no Advantage from these Words, till the Sense of 'em be first agreed on.

on, and that their Sense cannot be agreed on, till their just Construction be agreed on. All this is uncontestable.

Now these Words of Jesus Christ may be constru'd three different Ways. The first is this: *This is Life Eternal, to know that thou alone art the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* The second is this: *This is Life Eternal, that they may acknowledge thee for that God alone who is the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* And the third is: *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God.* We may examine them in order.

As to the first, I would fain know what can be the Sense of these Words: *This is Life Eternal, that they may know that thou alone art the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?* These Words are so far from attributing the Deity to the Father exclusively of the Son, that they visibly attribute it to them both. For the second Member of the Proposition is equivalent to this, *that they may know that he whom thou hast sent is also the only true God:* and the Sense of the Discourse can be only this: *That they may know that thou alone art the true God with him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.* Just as if one should speak to the Emperor, and tell him: *This is the Welfare of Hungary, that they may know that thou alone art the true King, and Arch-duke Joseph, whom thou hast appointed over them:* This Proposition would be, doubtless, equivalent to this: *That they may know thee the only true King, with Arch-duke Joseph thy Son.* Which is the Sense of the Words: as well as the Language of all Mankind. And though we might find innumerable Examples of it in Profane Authors: yet we shall content our selves with

John 15.

1 Cor. 4.

with producing such as are taken out of the Holy Scripture. When Jesus Christ, for instance, says to his Disciples, *Abide in me, and I in you*, we must necessarily take up the Verb *Abide*, and understand it in the second Member of the Proposition thus: *Abide in me, and I will abide in you*. And when St. Paul tells the Corinthians, *Tho' you had ten Thousand Instructors in Christ, yet not many Fathers*, (for these are the expresse Words in the Original) we must likewise repeat in the second Member of the Proposition what was exprest in the first, after this manner, *Though you had ten Thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many Fathers in Christ*. For this is evidently the true Sense of the Passage. It may be likewise said, that in these Words, *That they may know that thou alone art the true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, we must repeat in the second Member of the Proposition what was said in the first, after this manner, *That thou alone art the true God, and that Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent is the true God with thee alone*.

The Second Construction is this: *That they may know thee for that God who is the only true one, and that they may know him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ*. Now we must repeat in the second Member of the Proposition what is exprest in the first, after this manner: *That they may know thee for that God who is the only true one, and that they may know him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, for that only true God*. Otherwise the Sense of Jesus Christ's Words would be suspended and incomplete. *That they may know thee for that God who is the only true one*: so far is well. *And Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*: What? *That they may know him also to be that only true God*.

As for the Third Construction, That intirely favours our Opinion: *That they may know thee, and him whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God, or to be that God who alone is true.* This admits of no Difficulty. In a word, whether the Adjective *Only* falls upon *Thee, Father*, or upon *God*, or upon *true God*, the Construction of the Words will have nothing in 'em, against us.

'Tis of no Service to these Authors to alledge to us on this occasion that Passage in 1 Tim. 6. 16. which is exprest in these Words: *Which appearing he shall shew in his time, who is the Blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανάσιαν the only having Immortality*, Word for Word; but to reduce 'em to an ordinary Construction, *who only hath Immortality.* For as in this Passage these Words, *the only having Immortality*, are reduc'd to these, *who only hath Immortality*, they pretend that these *ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, the only true God*, ought to be reduc'd to these, *who alone is the true God.*

For first, 'tis certain that our Adversaries could produce no Example which would be more against them than this is. For as when the Son is call'd (and you will observe it is of Jesus Christ that mention is made in this Passage) as, I say, when Jesus Christ is call'd, *only Potentate, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, who only hath Immortality*, the Father is not excluded, who possesses unquestionably all those Qualities as well as the Son: So though the Father were called, *He who alone is the true God*, it would not follow, that the Son ought to be excluded, who bears this Name in Scripture, with other greater Titles which the Scripture gives him.

But to come more particularly to the point, I say, that there is a very great and essential

Dif.

Difference between the Passage which *Crellius* instances in, and the Passage now before us: that is, in the Example which he cites, *the only having Immortality* is a Nominative that does not depend on the Verb, but the Verb depends upon it; whereas in the Passage before us, *the only true God*, is an Accusative Case that depends on this Verb, *that they may know*; an Accusative, I say, which ought to be join'd not only with *Thee*, but also with the other Accusative that follows, *Him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ thy Son*: Which alters the Case entirely.

Besides, I would fain know how this Author durst render it, *That they may know thee who alone art the true God*, &c. when he has declared, that the Pronoun *Only* does not relate to *Thee*, and has said so expressly in the Passage we have quoted out of him?

In fine, I demand of our Adversaries, how they would reduce this Proposition, *that they may know thee the true God, and Jesus Christ*. I am persuaded that were they ever so little ingenuous, they would reduce it thus: *That they may know thee for the true God, thee and Jesus Christ*. Othēwise they must refuse to speak like other Men.

And certainly, when I form these Propositions: *That they may know thee the only Wise, and Jesus Christ thy Son*: *that they may know thee the only Immortal, and Jesus Christ thy Son*; *the only King, and Jesus Christ thy Son*, no body would ever think of saying, that in these Propositions I exclude Jesus Christ from *Wisdom, Immortality and Royalty*. On the contrary, every one would immediately see, that I comprehend in one and the same Proposition, the *Wisdom, the Immortality, and the Royalty* of the one and the

the other. Why then should they form a different Judgment of this Proposition, which is perfectly like the other? *That they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ thy Son?* For as to these Words, *whom thou hast sent*, 'tis plain, they do not alter the Nature of the Proposition, as being only a mere Epithet, or Adjective.

But when they render Jesus Christ's Words, by these, *that they may know thee who art, &c.* we are to see whether the Term *Only* is to be join'd with *thee Father*, or to be united with the Term *God*. This question is of no small Consequence. For if the Pronoun *Only* is apply'd to the Father, it signifies that the Father alone is the true God thus: *That they may know thee who alone art the true God.* But if the Pronoun *Only* is join'd with the Noun *God*, it only implies, that the Father is that God who alone is true. To see which of these two Explications is the better, we need only consult the Words in the Original. For 'tis observable, that the Article is not put before *God*, or before *true God*, but before these three Terms, *only true God*. If it were *ὁ μόνον ὁ ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, the meaning would be, *that, they may know thee alone the true God*: which Proposition might be reduc'd to this: *that they may know thee who alone art the true God.* But it is in the Original, *ὅτι ὁ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν*, *that they may know thee the only true God*: which signifies, *that they may know that thou art the only true God*, or, *that they may know thee alone who art that God, which alone is the true one.* Now this Proposition, *the Father is the God who is only true*, makes nothing at all against us. He that says, *the Father is God*, says also, *the Father is the only true God*. And likewise when we say, *that Jesus Christ is God*, we say, *be*

is the only true God. As then the Scripture does no wrong to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, in saying, that the Father is God : So neither does it prejudice his Divinity in saying, that the Father is the God who is only true.

But we are not satisfy'd with giving our Adversaries a bare Reply, we must further shew 'em, and prove to 'em, tho' we are not oblig'd to it, that Jesus Christ's Words in St. *John* do not exclude the Son from the true God-head. For which purpose we need only consider, 1. the Occasion upon which these Words are uttered : 2. other Passages of Scripture, which may be parallel to this : 3. the Analogy of Faith : 4. all the Terms and Expressions of this Passage : for every one hath its particular Sence, Force and Energy.

As to the Occasion which made Jesus Christ say, *that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent*, 'tis evidently in opposition to the Heathens that Jesus Christ thus exprest himself. And his Sence was this : *The Gentiles perish, because they have no Knowledge but of false Gods : but this is Life Eternal, to know thee for the true God, in opposition to Idols, and Jesus Christ thy Son.* This Sence favours Us. For who sees not that the words of this Text are plainly limited by the occasion of 'em? 'Tis true, *Crellius* hereupon says, that the Sence of a Discourse is not always limited by the Occasion of it, and it frequently happens that we deliver general Sentences on a particular Occasion. But we must understand one another. If *Crellius* means, that it happens sometimes, we grant it. If he means, that it happens always, we deny his Proposition. Of this you have several Instances in the Gospel. Thus when Jesus Christ says in the Case of *Lazarus*, *I am the*

Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in me, tho' he were dead, yet shall he live : or when upon his Disciples shewing him the Temple, he utters these words, which were to be understood only of his Body, *Destroy this Temple, and in three days will I raise it up agen :* 'Tis very plain, that upon a particular Occasion he delivers such Sentences as are General, and are not limited by the Subject he speaks of. But if *Crellius* means that Jesus Christ does always do so, he is grossly mistaken. Will they say, for instance, that when Jesus Christ tells St. Peter, *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona : For Flesh and Blood hath not reveal'd these things unto thee, &c.* that these words are not limited by the occasion which put 'em into our Saviour's Mouth ; and that by *these things* must not be understood that good Confession which St. Peter had just made concerning Jesus Christ ?

This Principle then abiding certain, that the Sence of a Discourse is sometimes limited, and sometimes not limited by the Occasion of it, we are to see in which number these words of Jesus Christ are to be plac'd, *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* Now, I say, that 'tis plain that the Sence of these words ought to be limited by the Occasion upon which they were utter'd, or, if you will, by the Objects that Jesus Christ had before his Eyes, or in his Mind, when he deliver'd them ; because these words include a double Allusion, which shews that they relate either to these Objects, or to this Occasion. The first is conceal'd in these words, *This is Life Eternal, &c.* and the Second in these, *the only true God.* Jesus Christ speaks of the only true God in allusion to the false Divinities of the Heathens : and he makes Eternal Life to consist in

in knowing this only true God, in allusion or opposition to the State of the Heathens, who were lost by having only false Objects of their Worship, and by not knowing the true God. One single Allusion to the Occasion upon which these words might be utter'd, would have been sufficient to limit the Sence of 'em on this occasion. What then is the meaning of two different Allusions? Certainly it must be granted, that these words signifie, according to the force of the double Allusion, which is as the very Life of it : so that as this double Allusion limits the Sense of these words, and makes us explain 'em thus, *that they may know thee for that only true God, as oppos'd to the false Gods which have betray'd the Heathens into a mortal Error, and the saving knowledge of whom is the Principle of the Eternal Life which we expect*; 'tis plain, that Crellius was mistaken, when he said, that the sence of these words was extended beyond the Occasion of 'em.

But, says our Author, suppose any one should chance to imagine that *Peter, James, or John*, is of one and the same Essence, and of one and the same Nature with the Eternal Father, might we not be allow'd to correct him, and to convince him by these words, *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee the only true God; and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*? And could the force of this Passage be well eluded by saying, that the Design of Jesus Christ in this place was only to exclude the false Divinities and Idols of the Heathens? I answer, 1. That this Example is very ill alledg'd for Three Reasons. First, because St. Peter is not in the same case with Jesus Christ. St. Peter is not God, he is not call'd the true God in Scripture: but our Adversaries acknowledge it all concerning Jesus Christ. St. Peter is not invested with all the Names, Prerogatives, Attributes

butes and Perfections of God : whereas we have prov'd it all concerning Jesus Christ. Secondly, because these words of St. *John* are spoken of the Father, and of Jesus Christ his Son, and not of the Father and of St. *Peter*. Jesus Christ does here partake of the Glory of the true God ; as we have prov'd by the just Construction of these words, *that they may know thee for the only true God, Thee, and Him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ thy Son.* Thirdly, because it is not necessary that these words, *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee,* &c. should overthrow all the Odd and Monstrous Opinions which might be conceiv'd upon the Subject of the God-head. For if St. *Peter*, for instance, should chance to fancy, that he is the Father, who alone is the true God, according to our Adversaries, I ask them, whether they could well convince him by these words, *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee, O Father, the only true God?* Would it not be rather the way to confirm this Man in his Error? 'Tis I, would he say, that am the Father; and this Passage makes me to be the true God.

In a word, to answer directly to the Objection, I affirm, that if we suppose St. *Peter* to be in the same Circumstances, wherein we suppose Jesus Christ to be ; viz. that St. *Peter* was before his Birth, that he was the Creator of Heaven and Earth, that he made the Worlds, that he is both the End and the Beginning of things Visible and Invisible, that he is God, True God, the Great God; the Almighty God, One with his Father, Equal with his Father, and the Same with his Father : I say, in this Case we cannot without extravagance refuse him the Title of true God.

II. We may convince our Adversaries by comparing this Passage with another parallel to it in

the 5th. Chap. of the 1st. Epistle of St. *John*, and the 21st. in these words: *But we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and Eternal Life.* We shall not now stay to refute the Criticisms of some of our Adversaries, who have been so bold to maintain, that these words, *This is the True God and Eternal Life*, ought not to be referr'd to *Jesus Christ*, who goes immediately before, but to *God*, who is spoken of in the Verse preceding, in these words, *We know that we are of God.* For nothing but an extreme desire to defend their Cause, whatever it costs 'em, could make 'em assert such a thing. 'Tis plain in effect, that he who is call'd *the true God and Eternal Life*, is the same with him who is call'd *true*, and of whom 'tis said, *We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ.* Socinus did not dare to deny it; and he does not only grant, that 'tis *Jesus Christ* who is here call'd *the true God and Eternal Life*, but he also owns, that this last Passage is parallel to this, *that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Though, saith he, *I am easily induc'd to think, that inasmuch as the Sense of this Passage seems to be intirely the same with that of Jesus Christ himself in St. John; this little Clause (this is the true God and Eternal Life) ought to be referr'd not only to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also to Jesus Christ himself, as much as it can and ought to be referr'd, &c.* And here it is that this Author falls into a manifest Contradiction. For if these two Passages are not parallel, why does he say, that the Sense of the one is the Sense of the other? And if they are parallel, how can they maintain that one of these Passages says, that
Jesus

Jesus Christ is the true God, and that the other implies, that Jesus Christ is *not* the true God ?

III. One of those Considerations which ought most to open our Adversaries Eyes, is that kind of Parallel which is here between the Father and the Son, who are put in one and the same Rank, and are a saving Object of our Faith, and of the Knowledge of Salvation. 'Tis pretended by our Adversaries, that Jesus Christ was to speak very modestly when he was praying to his Father. *Crellius* observes, that it was not proper for Jesus Christ to say, upon this occasion, that he was the only true God with his Father : Partly, saith he, *because he is praying to his Father, and consequently he ought to speak with extreme Modesty : and partly because he considers himself as his Fathers Messenger.* For it is not to be thought that when he's praying to his Father, he should equal himself with him, by attributing to himself so great a Title, as that the Father himself has no higher. Further, as he here considers himself as his Father's Messenger, we are not to think that he attributes to himself the Glory and Majesty of him that sent him, which consists in his being the only true God. Certainly, if Jesus Christ is not the only true God with his Father, 'tis no Modesty in him not to call himself the only true God with him, so far is it from being extreme Modesty. 'Twould be extravagant Modesty in a Subject to say, he is not the Prince or the Sovereign of the State. Fine Modesty, indeed ! that should hinder a little Dust and Ashes from calling it self the Creator of all things, God blessed for evermore. But I believe I may say, that never was Modesty more offended by any in this World, than 'twould be by Jesus Christ upon this occasion, if Jesus Christ were but a mere Man or a mere Creature :

Crell. De
Uno De
Patre.
p. 24.

ture: and to return *Crellius* his own Words, I affirm, that neither Modesty, nor the Quality of Messenger, would permit Jesus Christ to join himself with the Father, and to Name himself after him as an Object that is the Happiness of Mankind, if Jesus Christ were but a mere Creature. *Modesty* would not suffer it. For if Jesus Christ is a mere Creature, he is not, in respect of the Supreme God, so much as a Grain of Dust is to the Firmament, as a Wax-Candle is to the Sun, or as the smallest Worm to the Lord of the Universe. Shall we then say, that the Firmament and a Grain of Dust support the World? that the Sun and a Wax-Candle give us Light? and that the Lord of the Universe and a Worm makes great Revolutions in States? This would be perfectly odious, Neither would the Quality of *Messenger* bear it. For, I pray, in what Empire, or Kingdom was the Servant ever known to Name himself with his Master, and to attribute every thing to himself and the Sovereign? If a King's Officer had been so bold to give out that every thing in the Kingdom must be done in the King's and his own Name; if he had had the Confidence to cause his Name to be stamp'd with his Master's Name on the Coin, and publick Edifices; if Pardons were issu'd out in his Name, this would be such a Crime of High-Treason as could not be expiated by any thing less than a most cruel Death. How then durst Jesus Christ say now a-days, that Eternal Life consists in knowing the Supreme God, and in knowing himself? How durst he institute Sacraments with this Form, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?* How durst we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, &c.*

IV. The Fourth Consideration which shews us that the Son ought not to be excluded from the God-head of the Father, is the Consideration of the Term *Know*, which is here us'd: *That they may know thee, &c.* For either by *Know* we must understand a simple, naked and theoretical Knowledge; in which case this Passage is false. For it is not true, that Eternal Life consists in knowing God and Jesus Christ in this naked, simple, and theoretical manner. It is not so much we that say so, but 'tis our Adversaries themselves. Besides, 'tis false, says Crellius, that *Eternal Life, or the means to obtain it, consists in knowing that the Father and his Son Jesus Christ are the only and true God.* This cannot hold if taken according to the Letter. Otherwise it were necessary and sufficient in order to obtain Eternal Life, to acknowledge the Father and the Son for the only true God. And so at this Rate, all that are of this Opinion would obtain Eternal Life, though at the same time they might be guilty of such Sins, as, according to the express Declaration of Scripture, exclude 'em from the Kingdom of Heaven. You will then say, that all this should be taken in an improper Sense in such a manner as that this Knowledge comprehends in it Faith in Jesus Christ, and a Faith working by Love, and all sorts of Graces, &c.

De Uno
Deo Patre
Sect. 1.
1 arg. p.
21.

But if by this Knowledge we are to understand an efficacious and practical Knowledge, then by knowing the true God must be manifestly understood to serve him, and by serving him must be understood both the Worship that is due to him, and the Obedience that we pay him, and Faith and Charity, and all sorts of Graces that relate to the Service of God. These are Crellius's Words. Now as the Term *Know* is not only apply'd to the Father, but also to the Son;

for the Text does not say merely, *that they may know thee Father*, but, *that they may know thee, and thy Son Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, this one single Verb being apply'd to both these different Subjects: it follows, that Eternal Life does not only consist in serving God with Faith, Charity, Religious Worship, and all sorts of other Graces, but that it also consists in paying all these same Duties to Jesus Christ. But it we ought to know Jesus Christ by worshipping him, obeying him, believing in him, and by exercising Charity for his sake. I affirm, that Jesus Christ ought necessarily to be the true God; because we can owe this sort of Homage to no other but the true God. 'Tis only the true God whom we ought to worship and serve in a religious manner. *Thou shalt worship*, saith the Law-giver, commented upon by the Teacher come from God, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. We can glorifie none but the true God by Obedience, Faith, Love, and by all sorts of Graces, because there is none but the Infinite Being, that deserves the various Sacrifices which all these different Graces present him.

V. This Reflexion may and ought to be supported by another, which we shall make upon the Expression, *Life Eternal*. There is none but an Infinite Being that can make the Life of his Creatures Eternal. Jesus Christ is not an Infinite Being, if he is not the true God with his Father. He cannot therefore render our Life Eternal, if he is not the true God with his Father. In effect, when the Scripture tells us, that the Knowledge of God is Eternal Life, and that the Knowledge of Jesus Christ is Eternal Life, either it means that the Knowledge of Jesus Christ is Eternal Life, in the same Sense that the Knowledge of God is; or it means in a different Sense.

If

If it means in a quite different Sense, nothing can be more deceitful than are these Words of the Scripture, they are equivocal and unintelligible. If it means in the same Sense, it follows, that Jesus Christ known gives us Eternal Life, or makes Life Eternal in us in the same manner as does the Father known. But the Father makes Life Eternal only because he is the true God : So says the Text expressly. *This is Life Eternal, to know thee the only true God.* It follows then, that Jesus Christ makes Life Eternal only as he is the true God. Again, either the Knowledge of Jesus Christ makes Life Eternal, because Eternal Life consists in this Knowledge, or because this Knowledge is the Principle of Eternal Life. If 'tis because Eternal Life consists formally in this Knowledge, then Jesus Christ must be the Sovereign Good. For Eternal Life consists merely and formally in the Possession of the Sovereign Good. If 'tis because the Knowledge of Jesus Christ is the Principle of Eternal Life. I demand further, whether this Knowledge is the Principle of Eternal Life, because 'tis the efficient Cause of it, or purely because this Knowledge is a Mean to attain to the Possession of Life Eternal? If 'tis because this Knowledge is a Principle properly so called, an efficient Cause, a Source of Eternal Life, it follows, that the Object of this Knowledge ought to be the true God : for 'tis the Knowledge of the true God alone that humbles and sanctifies us, and produces both Happiness and Holiness, which are the two parts of Eternal Life. If 'tis only because this Knowledge is either a mere Condition, or a mere Mean to obtain Eternal Life. I say, that in this Case we cannot say in a better Sense, *This is Life Eternal to know Jesus Christ*, than that, *This is Life*

*Life Eternal to know the Law, to know the Scriptures, to know Heaven and Eternity. This is Life Eternal for the Israelites to know Moses. 'Tis Life Eternal for the Proselyte Jews, and the Gentiles that were converted to the Gospel, to know the Apostles. For 'tis certain that the Knowledge of the Apostles for true Apostles, was a Condition without which the new Christians could not attain to Life ; as the Knowledge of Moses for the Minister and Messenger of God was a Condition without which the Israelites could not obey God, nor consequently obtain Eternal Life : Or, if you will, the Knowledge of the Apostles and the Knowledge of Moses being the means to bring Men to God, were likewise the means to obtain Eternal Life. I will not allow 'em to have been very great means : 'tis enough they were means, we demand no more. And yet it must be granted, that it would have been impious and blasphemous to speak after this manner : *This is Life Eternal to know Moses. This is Life Eternal to know the Apostles.* But it would have been the height of Impiety, if *Moses* and the *Apostles* had been called *Eternal Life*, as the Scripture calls *Jesus Christ Eternal Life*. *This is*, saith *St. John*, *the true God and Eternal Life.**

Certainly, whosoever well considers these last words, will find, that according to the Holy Ghost's thought, there is some Affinity between these words, *the true God*, and these, *Eternal Life*, and that the Holy Ghost design'd to give us to understand, that 'tis because *Jesus Christ* is the true God, that he is *Eternal Life*, and that inasmuch as he is *Eternal Life*, he is the true God. Thus in these words of *Jesus Christ* which are parallel to that Passage, *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ*

Christ whom thou hast sent, it appears very reasonable to think, that Jesus Christ causeth Eternal Life by the Knowledge of him, only because he is the true God.

To conclude, these Two Truths appear to us to be certain in this matter. First, that when Jesus Christ is call'd Eternal Life, or when 'tis said, that Eternal Life consists in knowing Jesus Christ, this Expression does not mean barely that Jesus Christ promiseth Eternal Life, or that Jesus Christ giveth Eternal Life. For *Moses*, for instance, promist the *Israelites* the Land of *Canaan*; and yet he is not call'd the Land of *Canaan*. *Josuah* introduc'd the *Israelites* into the Land of *Canaan*; but he is not call'd the Land of *Canaan*: and these Expressions would be lookt upon as absurd, and Extravagant, if any one made use of 'em. Jesus Christ then is call'd Eternal Life, and 'tis said, that Eternal Life consists in the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, to teach us not only that Jesus Christ promiseth it, not only that he giveth it, but that this Object gives birth to it, that Jesus Christ is the Source of it, that we need only know Jesus Christ well in order to be Holy and Happy, that is to say, to Enjoy the Two Parts of Life Eternal. The Second thing that appears to us uncontestable is, that whatever Object causeth Eternal Life in this last Sence, must be necessarily an infinite Object. For if it be a mere Creature, we cannot give it such an Encomium, without being guilty of Impiety, because this Encomium is the Encomium of the true God. *This is Life Eternal, to know thee the only true God, &c. This is the true God and Eternal Life.*

VI. And now we come to consider the Name *God*. Our Adversaries labour very hard to persuade us that the Name *God* is not a proper Name, but an Appellative. Upon this they have writ

writ whole Treatises : and we need not wonder at it. For if it be once certain that the Name *God* is the proper Name of the Supreme Being, they can no longer forbear to acknowledge Jesus Christ for the Supreme Being, because they agree that the Name *God* is very frequently given him in Scripture, and even in such places as are in no wise suspected either of Figure, or Exaggeration. They pretend then, that the Name *God* is an Appellative ; that 'tis frequently given to others besides the true and Supreme God, tho' it be also sometimes given to the latter. And here we shall reason from their own Principle, without ever entring into this Dispute with ^{em}, and shall say, that since the Name *God* is an Appellative, we ought to form much the same Judgment of it as we do of the Name *King*, which is so too, and is given to God by way of Excellence, but may also agree to others besides God. I demand then of our Adversaries, whether supposing that the words of the *Text* were, *This is Life Eternal to know thee the only true King, and thy Son Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, whether they would believe that in these words the Expression, *only true King*, belongs to the Father exclusively of the Son, or whether they would think that it belongs to the Father and the Son at the same time ? Certainly they would understand these words thus : *This is Life Eternal to know thee the only true King, thee Father, with him whom thou hast sent, even thy Son Jesus Christ*. Now then the Name *God* is no less Appellative than that of *King*, according to their own Principle. It follows therefore, that they ought to make no difficulty of rendring Jesus Christ's words in St. *John* thus : *This is Life Eternal, that they may know thee to be the true God, thee Father, with him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ*.

VII. The Term *True* will furnish us with a Seventh Argument. Our Adversaries understand by the true God in this place, the great God by way of Excellence; the Supreme God *ὁ ὢν ὁ θεός*. But it will be proper to remove the Equivocation they start here. 'Tis granted, that the true God is the Supreme God, and that the Supreme God is the true God. If this be all our Adversaries mean, we agree with 'em. But we pretend that the Idea of true God, and the Idea of Supreme Being, are two different Ideas which represent the same Object, or two very different ways of conceiving the same God. The Idea of true God opposes this Object to such as falsely bear the Name of God, that is, to Idols. The Idea of Supreme God, or of Supreme Being, opposes it to all other Beings which are necessarily inferiour to him. We may very well then confound the Object that is express'd by the Term *true God*, with that which is express'd by the Term *Supreme God*: but yet it is not allowable to confound the Idea of Supreme God with the Idea of true God; and yet this is what our Adversaries always do, when they reason against us from this Passage. 'Tis to no purpose to say, that the Term *true* is us'd sometimes to express something noble and excellent as when we say, *Constantine was a true Emperor, Alexander was a true Hero*, meaning, *Constantine had all the Qualities which an Emperor ought to have, Alexander was a great Hero*. I own, that sometimes the Term *true* is us'd to denote the Excellency of the Subject spoken of: but sometimes also this Expression signifies only the Truth of it; and here we have unquestionable Fact. 'Tis said, *Henry IV. was the true King of France when he fought against the League after Henry III's Death*: and hereby is only signify'd, that he did not usurp the Crown:

Now

Now in this place it cannot be deny'd but (the *only true God* including a manifest Allusion to the Multitude of Pagan Divinities, which falsely bore this Name, and this Allusion being not so much as contested by our Adversaries,) that the Term *true* rather signifies the plain truth of the thing, than its Excellence. The Sence then of these words is this; *The Gentiles know no other than false Gods, and this is the reason that they perish: but thou, thou art the only true God with thy Son, and this Knowledge giveth Eternal Life.*

And if so, 'tis very easie to prove, that the Expression *only true God* ought to be referr'd as well to the Son, as to the Father. For if the Expression *true God* ought to be restrain'd to the Father, either 'tis because this Title is not repeated in the Second Member of the Proposition, or because this Title is too excellent to belong to the Son. It is not because the Title is not repeated, since we have already shew'd, that the Analogy of Language requires the Title to be understood, as well as the Verb *Know*. Neither is it because this Title is too excellent for Jesus Christ; for it signifies no more, than a God that is not devis'd, but that exists really: And who can doubt, but that if Jesus Christ is God, as our Adversaries acknowledge, he is also a true God in this Sense?

In a word, this is the God that is oppos'd to Idols, *viz.* a God who does not merely exist in the Imagination of Men, but who exists really and truly: and I ask, whether this Epithet belongs to Jesus Christ or not? If it does not, it follows, that Jesus Christ, who is most certainly God, by our Adversaries own Confession, is a false and an imaginary God. And if this Epithet does belong to Jesus Christ, it follows, that Jesus Christ is the only true God:

VIII. But

VIII. But perhaps the Ajective *Only* join'd with *true God*, gives this Title an Excellence, which makes it belong only to the Father. But this cannot be, for several Reasons. First, then, as the Term *Only* determines that of *True*, it may be also said, that the Term *true* determines that of *Only*: *Only true God* is oppos'd to the Multitude of false Gods. Further, *only true God* is not the Epithet of the Father, but the Epithet of the Father and the Son: as in this Passage: *Or have not I only and Barnabas power not to work?* The Term *Only* which in the Construction is the Epithet only of *Paul*, is in the true Sense of the Words the Epithet of *Paul* and *Barnabas*. In the third Place, tho' the Term *Only* were the Epithet, not of God, as belonging to the Father and the Son, but of the Father; tho' it were in the Text, *that they may know the Father only to be the true God*, &c. yet we should not press too much upon the Term *Only*, which does not always exclude so much as it seems to exclude, as may be prov'd by a very fit and unquestionable Instance. I ask then, of whom it is that the Scripture speaks, when it says, *the only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who only hath Immortality?* We say, that 'tis of Jesus Christ: But we will suppose our selves, if they please, to be mistaken. Whether they attribute all these Epithets to the Father, or to the Son, is to us indifferent: They will still find what we advanc'd to be true, *viz.* that the Pronoun *Only* does not limit so much as it seems to limit. For can it be said of the Father, that *he is the only Potentate*, that *he only hath Immortality*? No, doubtless: both these Qualities belong likewise to the Son. Can it be said of the Son, that *he is the only Potentate, only Immortal*: No, certainly: both these

Titles

Titles belong likewise to the Father. If then the Pronoun *Only* being apply'd to the Father, does indeed exclude other Objects, but not the Son, and if when apply'd to the Son, it excludes not the Father, it follows that in the Passage before us, the Term *Only*, though it were apply'd to the Father, should not therefore be thought to exclude the Son, especially since the Son is call'd both *God*, and *the true God*, as well as the Father; and he says himself, *I am in my Father, and my Father is in me*. Thus we do not only answer the most plausible of their Objections, but we also shew that they favour us, and that the Passages they quote against us with the greatest Ostentation, do themselves confirm our Opinion.

CHAP. V.

Wherein we further answer the Objections of our Adversaries.

MUCH such an Objection is rais'd by our Adversaries from the 8. Chap. v. 4. of the 1st Epist. of St. Paul to the Corinthians, where the Apostle useth these Words: *As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in Sacrifice unto Idols, we know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him, &c.*

From

From which Passage *Crellius* draws this Argument. *A Second Testimony, which we shall produce to prove our Sentiment concerning the Unity of the Divinity of the Father, shall be that celebrated Passage of St. Paul, wherein he tells us the meaning of that one God, when he says : To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we by him. What could be said clearer to prove that there is no other can be this only God, but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ? In effect, St. Paul explaining who this only God is, says simply, that 'tis the Father, and not that 'tis the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But there was no reason for St. Paul when he was to explain who this one God is, should make mention only of the Father, and leave out the other Persons, if 'tis true that this one God is not only the Father, but also the Son and Holy Ghost ; because these two last Persons were as proper to shew who this only God is, as the Person of the Father, and consequently should not have been past over in Silence.*

And here it will not be amiss to premise some few Reflexions, which may serve as so many general Answers to the Difficulty before us. The First then is this ; that if we examine narrowly into this Passage, with several others parallel to it, we shall find that the Names *Father* and *God*, do not signifie one single Person of the God-head, but that Essence and God-head which is common to all the Persons. This is what Divines understand, when they say in their Language, that God is there taken *εως ος ως*. God then, that Eternal, Invisible, Incorruptible, Immense, Omnipotent Being, who is neither the Father alone, nor the Son alone, nor the Holy Ghost alone, but who comprehends both the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is call'd Father in a large and general Sence, because he is the first Cause

Cause of whom are all things, and we by him. In this Place he is call'd Father, in the same sence that he is call'd elsewhere *the Father of Lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect Gift*: Or in the same sence that he is call'd in the 4th. to the *Ephes. One God and Father of all, &c.* Where the Attribute *Father* is General, and imports that God is the first Cause of all things. 'Tis an Attribute like that of Creator, Redeemer, Saviour, which belong to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, because they are affixt to the Essence that is common to the Three Persons. *Crellius* argues to no purpose, when he would shew, that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, are never call'd in Scripture by the Name of Father. He is out in the Premise, and Conclusion. In the Premise. For Jesus Christ is call'd the *Everlasting Father*, in the Oracle of *Esaia*s, as is acknowledged by *Crellius* himself. Which Expression shewes us, that Jesus Christ may be likewise call'd *the Father of all Things*. For as Jesus Christ is call'd the Father of Ages, because he made the Worlds, according to the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost; nothing hinders us from saying also, that Jesus Christ is the Father of all things, in that all things were made by Jesus Christ. *For all things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.* 'Twill be told me, that indeed Jesus Christ is call'd the Father of Ages, but not simply the Father. I answer First, that neither is God call'd in the Passage before us, simply the Father, but *the Father of whom are all things*. I ask further, why this Title is not given to Jesus Christ. Is it because 'tis too great for him, and for that reason it ought to be peculiar to the Supreme God? Or, because 'tis too mean, and therefore it ought to be peculiar to the Creature? If 'tis because of the latter, how then

is the Supreme God call'd our Father? And if because of the former, how durst St. Paul, who is but a Creature, call himself by this Name? For, saith he, *tho' you had many Instructors in Jesus Christ, yet have ye not many Fathers.* If Jesus Christ is not our Father, how is it said of Jesus Christ, that *when he shall make his Soul an Offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, &c.*? And how can he say to God, *Behold me, and the Children which thou gavest me*, according to the Application which the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* makes of this Oracle to him? How does Jesus Christ give us a Second Birth? How does he regenerate us, create us? How is he our Second *Adam*? How is he call'd our Resurrection and our Life? But, once more, we need not insist upon this Consideration. The Attribute of *Father* may be taken two ways: Either 'tis alone, or 'tis join'd with other Adjectives which restrain it. We agree, that when 'tis alone, it signifies that Person of the Godhead which is distinct from the Son. But here the Attribute of *Father* is certainly restrain'd in this Passage. We must not say, *To us there is but one God, the Father*, and stop here; but, *to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.* If the Apostle had said, *There is but one God, the first Cause of whom are all things*, our Adversaries would find nothing in this Apostle's Words, that could favour them; and though we could not find in Scripture a like Epithet given to Jesus Christ, or to the Holy Ghost, this would not very much perplex us, nor hinder us from agreeing, that all those Objects to which the Title of God belongs, may be also call'd the first Cause of whom are all things. Now 'tis plain, that the *Father of whom are all Things*, and the *first Cause of whom are all things*, are equivalent Ex-

pressions; and consequently they can gain no more advantage by the one than by the other.

The second General Answer which we may make this Objection is, that tho' the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, partake of one and the same Essence, as is plain from the Scripture's attributing to them the same Glory, and the same Perfections, yet these three Persons of the most Holy and Glorious Trinity, do appear in the Work of our Redemption under a very different Form. The Father orders, the Son executes, and the Holy Ghost applies. The Father, who sends his Son to treat of the Covenant, is properly He that sustains the Person and Character of God: And for this reason he's oftner call'd God than the other Persons. The Son appears as Mediatour, holding the place of Men, and invested with the Rights of the God-head. And the Holy Ghost holds the place of God and of Jesus Christ, and supplies the absence of the latter. We should not therefore wonder that the Name of God, which is common to all the Persons of the most Holy and Glorious Trinity, should be attributed to the Father, who sustains this Character in a very particular manner in the great Work of our Redemption.

It must be added, in the Third place, that the Pronoun *One* which limits the Name of God in this place, is not taken in that great rigour which our Adversaries urge. I mean, that this Pronoun very well excludes the other things spoken of and alluded to in the verses preceding; but not all other Objects in general. What I advance is prov'd by several different Examples. When Jesus Christ says to his Disciples in St. *John*, *Ye shall leave me alone*, the Pronoun

alone

alone very well excludes the Men then in question, but it does not exclude God. That which proves this is, that Jesus Christ adds immediately after, *But I am not alone, for the Father is with me.* When 'tis said, *There is no Salvation in any other but in him,* this Expression very well excludes Men, but it does not exclude the Father. When 'tis said, *that there is but one Teacher, viz Jesus Christ,* the Term *One* excludes other Men from the Excellency of this Title, but not God; for 'tis said by the Prophets, *They shall be all taught of God.* 'Tis said of the Shew-bread, that it was not lawful for any to eat of 'em, *but the Priests alone*: the Pronoun *alone* excludes those that were of another Family, but not the Children of the Priests. When 'tis said, *that we are justify'd by Faith alone,* the meaning is to exclude Works, but not God, Jesus Christ, the Divine Mercy, the Sacrifice of the Cross, which justify as each of 'em in its own respect. When God says by the Mouth of *Esaïas, I am the Lord,* Isa. 43. *and beside me there is no Saviour, &c.* without doubt the Prophet did not mean [to exclude Jesus Christ who bears the Name of our Saviour in Scripture, and of whom it was said by the Prophet, *that he should be call'd the God and Saviour of the whole Earth,* The same Prophet speaking of the last day, says, *that God alone shall be exalted in that Day*: and as our Adversaries themselves do not deny but that Jesus Christ is to come to judge the Quick and the Dead, they cannot but also own, that Jesus Christ is to share in this Exaltation, and they ought to acknowledge that the Pronoun *alone* excludes only Idols, or the Creatures in General, which is the thing the Prophet had in his Eye.

But if we had a mind to inlarge and prove, that the Pronoun *Alone* is only exclusive ac-

Gen. 42.

according to the matter and circumstances of the Text, and if I would confirm it by Examples, I should never have done. 'Twould be very pretty for a Man, in reading these Words of *Jacob*, *My Son Benjamin shall not go down with you; for his Brother is dead, and he is left alone*, to conclude from hence, that *Benjamin* was the only Son of *Jacob*, and that *Judah* and his Brethren were not that Patriarch's Children. And when the Evangelist, after he had given the History of Jesus Christ's Transfiguration, and had represented that Divine Saviour discoursing with *Moses* and *Elias*, says, that there was a Voice from Heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son. &c.* and that when this Voice was heard, Jesus Christ was all alone, could we prove that Jesus Christ was alone in all respects, and that his Disciples were not with him? *Martha* says to Jesus Christ, *Lord, dost thou not care that my Sister hath left me to serve alone?* would we conclude from hence, that there were no Servants (Men or Women) in the House?

This Language is not peculiar to the Holy Ghost: But all Mankind speak and have ever spoken after the same manner. This Proposition, *Augustus alone compleated the Ruine of Pompey's House*, does not exclude either *Agrippa* or other of *Augustus's* Lieutenants.

It is then a most certain Maxim, that the Pronoun *Alone* ought not to be taken in the whole Extent and Force which its natural Signification gives it, but that 'tis restrain'd by the Things spoken of, and other Circumstances of the Discourse. And if so, I say, that in the Passage before us, the Pronoun *One*, which is added to God, may very well exclude Idols, the several Things that are upon Earth and in Heaven, and even those things which have been honour'd with the Name of Gods and
 Lords,

Lords, because this is the subject matter of this place; but I deny that this Pronoun does also at the same time exclude Jesus Christ, who on the contrary is represented to us as partaking of one and the same Sovereignty, and of one and the same Glory with the true God.

Of which we shall not in the least doubt, if we add, in the Fourth Place, that according to the Ideas which the Scripture gives us in this point, there is so strict an Union between the Father and the Son, that what is said of the one, is also to be understood of the other. Jesus Christ is not content to say, that he and the Father are one; which, to stop there, might seem to be understood of an Unity of Accord: But he tells us, that in possessing the Son, we possess the Father. *He that hath the Son, hath Life. He that hath not the Son hath not Life.* He says, that *whosoever honoureth the Son, honoureth the Father.* He gives us to understand that in knowing the one, we know the other. *Philip, he that hath seen me, hath seen my Father, and how say'st thou, shew me the Father.* He tells us, that whatsoever is the Father's is his. The Scripture attributes to them the same Perfections, the same Titles, the same Works, the same Properties, the same Glory, &c.

From hence it follows, in the Fifth Place, that when the Scripture attributes any Quality, or any Perfection to the Father alone, it does not mean to exclude the Son. This our Adversaries themselves are forc'd to own, and thereby to acknowledge the weakness of their own Objection. For when Jesus Christ says, that *there is none Good, except God*, do they mean to exclude Jesus Christ? and is it not a perpetual Truth, that Jesus Christ is the meek one by way of Excellence? And when that Divine Saviour

says to us, *Call not any on Earth your Master; for one is your Master*, does he mean to exclude himself? And when God is represented to us as being our only Saviour, must we exclude Jesus Christ? Or when Jesus Christ is represented to us as our only Saviour, there being no Salvation in any other, must we exclude God? The Scripture attributes to God, the Being, *only* Wise, *only* Good, and having *only* Immortality: must we say that the Pronoun *Only* excludes all other Objects in such a manner, as that those Titles do not belong to Jesus Christ? And when St. Paul determines to know nothing, *save Jesus Christ, and him crucified*, must he needs have designed to say, that the Knowledge of the Father is not necessary to our Salvation? And when 'tis said, *No one knoweth the Things of God, but the Spirit of God which is in him*, could we reasonably conclude from thence, that the Father and the Son know not the Things that be of God.

From these general Reflexions, I come now to my Author, whom I design to follow step by step. St. Paul, saith he, *explaining who this one God is, says, that 'tis the Father, and does not say, that 'tis the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*.

All this is false. Neither does St. Paul explain who this one God is, nor does he say, that this one God is the Father exclusively of the Son and Holy Ghost. St. Paul does not explain who this only true God is: or if it be call'd an Explication, 'tis an imperfect Explication, a Description, or an Explication proportion'd to the matter in hand. It was not in any wise St. Paul's business in this place to explain the Nature and Essence of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to observe what the Father had more excellent, or nobler than his Son:
But

But his Business was to describe the God that is oppos'd to Idols, and to signifie the advantage he has not only over these Idols, but also over Kings, Magistrates, and Angels, who were sometimes honour'd with the Name of God. And this is what induces the Apostle to describe this one God by such Characters as exalt him above all the other Objects; and remembring that the Prophets made this Description of created Gods, *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, shall perish from under these Heavens*, he makes this opposite Description of the true God, *There is but one God, the Father of all Things, or, of whom are all Things, and we by him.* .

In effect, (continues our Author) the Apostle's Design in this place was to explain who this one God is. But, pray, does he explain a thing well, who omits more things that are fit to illustrate it, than he expresses: and who instead of speaking of three Persons, make mention only of one, as the Apostle would do in this place? Pray, which of our Adversaries designing to explain who this one God is, would make mention only of the Father, and say, that there is but one God, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and would not rather say, that there is but one God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

But 'tis false to say, that the Apostle's Design was fully to explain who this one God is. His Design was to make him known as much as his Subject requir'd, by giving him a Character, which exalts him above all created Lordships and Divinities, and calling him *the Father of whom are all things, and we by him*. It is not necessary that every time we speak of a thing, we should undertake to explain it: much less is it necessary that every time we describe a thing by some Epithet

by the bye, we should explain it fully. The Apostle somewhere declares, that *he determines to know nothing, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.* Will they say, that this Discourse is absurd, because the Apostle undertaking to explain the Knowledge of Salvation, omits more things than he expresses, making no manner of mention of God the Father, though Jesus Christ declares, that *this is Life Eternal, to know this only true God, &c.* and speaking neither of the Holy Ghost, nor of Eternal Life, &c. nor of other Objects which the Scripture propounds to our Faith? 'Tis reported in the 16th. of the *Acts*, that *the Jaylor who kept Paul and Silas Prisoners, having been struck with astonishment by what the Angel of the Lord had done in their behalf, having brought them out, and said to them, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? They said to him, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy House.* Will they say, that these Apostles spoke impertinently upon this occasion? Their business was to answer the Jailour's Question, who would know what he was to do to be sav'd. It was more necessary for them to explain themselves intirely and perfectly upon this occasion than upon that before us. And yet upon this occasion, which seems to require the Apostle to explain himself altogether, the Apostle explains himself but by halves. He does not tell him, that he must believe in God and the Holy Ghost, though that was indispensably necessary, because he was to be baptiz'd in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He does not tell him, that 'tis necessary for him to repent, tho' Repentance is no less necessary than Faith. We must not doubt but that *Paul and Silas* explain'd all these things to the Jailor: but neither ought we to doubt, but

but that Jesus Christ explain'd the Mystery of the Incarnation, at least in such measure as was proportion'd and suitable to the Condition wherein the Disciples then were; and that the Disciples also explain'd it according to the Capacity of the Christians of their time. The Eunuch of Queen Cardace thus describes his Faith in the Lord: *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* But was this the only Object of his Faith? And can we say that a Man explains himself well, who *conceals more things that are fit to illustrate it than he expresses?* 'Tis neither necessary nor possible to say every thing upon all sorts of occasions; and a Man must be ignorant both of Divine and Humane Language, to imagine that the Explications given of a thing by an Adjective, or Epithet, ought to be exact Definitions according to the Rules of Logic, and to take the whole Extent of their Object. Indeed, Philosophers speak thus, but other Men speak in a quite different manner. 'Tis true, since we have begun to dispute upon these important Matters, we love to speak with such Caution as would be needless, if these Questions had been never agitated; and we chuse to say, as often as 'tis possible, One God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But how often do we express our selves otherwise? And upon how many Occasions, do we give God thanks as the only Author of our Being and Salvation through Jesus Christ his Son, and our Divine Mediator? Which is to speak much as our Apostle does.

Who among 'em (adds Crellius) would fail of saying, that 'tis the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Indeed, he must speak so, if he would speak consequently to his Principles: And so much the more ought the Apostle to speak after this manner, (if he had been of our Adversaries Sentiment) in that
be

be ought to take care not to give occasion to take this great and pernicious Error (as they think it) which would consist in believing that God is one as well in Person as in Essence, and that none but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is God.

To speak consequently to his Principles, it is not necessary that a Man should always explain his Principles fully ; and tho' we are very well persuaded of the Mystery of the Trinity, we may very well speak of the Father without mentioning the Son, and of the Son without mentioning the Father, and of the Holy Ghost without mentioning the Father and Son ; and it is not necessary that every Word which we utter should be an Explication of this Grand Mystery. Neither was it necessary, that at every Word which the Apostles utter'd they should apprehend giving an occasion to some great Heresie. As the Errors that are possible, and even great and mortal Errors are Infinite, they had never spoken, if they must have prevented them all. But here I admire at our Adversaries blindness, who while they are endeavouring to argue against us, furnish us with an invincible Argument against themselves. Have they thought well upon what they advance on this occasion ? Did they not see that we might engage and defeat 'em with their own Weapons ? How ! if the Apostles should have forbore giving occasion to dangerous and mortal Errors, should they not have avoided using such Language, as by its most natural Impressions engages Men in Blasphemy and Impiety ? Can they, without abandoning all the Care they should have of the Salvation of Mankind, and the Glory of God, can they apply to Jesus Christ the Characters

acters of the most essential, most peculiar, and most incommunicable Glory of the Deity? Can they apply to him those Oracles which do manifestly speak only of the Supreme God? Can they say, that Jesus Christ is God, that he is before all things, that he created all things, that he is the beginning and end of all things, that he is equal with God, that every Knee ought to bow before him, that every Tongue ought to give him praise, that he is the Prince of Peace, the Everlasting Father, &c? And in all these Passages that are levelled against us, could the Apostles associate Jesus Christ with his Father, as one equal with another? Can they say that Eternal Life consists in knowing the Father, and in knowing Jesus Christ; and now opposing the latter to false Gods, and to subordinate Gods, as well as to other Lords, *declare, that there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we by him; and one Lord, by whom are all things and we by him,* as if Jesus Christ were upon the square with his Father? Is there any thing more scandalous, or more impious, than this Familiarity with which Jesus Christ treats the Supreme God, if it be true that he is but a mere Creature? This is strange. It seems that the Holy Ghost was only to take care of the Salvation of our Adversaries. He was to avoid betraying them into a dangerous Error. How! should he not also have avoided giving us an occasion of Impiety and Blasphemy? Certainly nothing is so pernicious, nothing so incommunicable as the Glory of God: nothing therefore should have been avoided with so much care, as the giving Christians occasion to divest the Supreme God of his Glory, for to give it another.

From whence it likewise appears, (says Crellius) that what some of 'em answer is idle, when they say that

A Treatise concerning the

that St. Paul says, that this One God is the Father by attribution or appropriation, as they call it. For at this rate he would not have instructed the Vulgar Christians, but rather have led 'em into a most pernicious Error. In Effect, the People don't know wherein this Attribution, which is here Establish'd, consists; seeing many among the Learned themselves have never heard it so much as talkt of, &c.

The Name Attribution is perhaps unknown, but the Thing is well known; and 'tis the Thing that is chiefly in question: of which may be given innumerable Examples. Attribution consists in given a Name to One alone, which belongs to many others. Thus, as the Name of Lord belongs to the Father and the Son, 'tis an Attribution to give it to Jesus Christ alone: and as the Name of God belongs also to the One and the Other, 'tis a like Attribution to give it to the Father alone. The same is to be said of the Title of Saviour or Redeemer. This Title is common to God the Father, and to Jesus Christ his Son. When 'tis given to Jesus Christ alone, and 'tis said, for instance, that *there is no Name under Heaven, by which we must be saved*, this is called an Attribution or an Appropriation of a Name common to the Father and the Son, given to the Son only. Shall we say, that the Scripture did not know a Love of Appreciation, and a Love of Intention, because these Terms which come from the Schools, are not found in Scripture? 'Tis true, the Names are not there, but the Thing is. The Love of Intention consists in loving God with all our Heart, with all our Strength, &c. and the Love of Appreciation, in leaving Houses, Kindred, Goods, &c. for the sake of God. 'Tis the same with the Case before us. For either the Author who makes us the Objection meant only, that the Term Attribution

tion is strange to vulgar Christians, or he thought that the Thing represented by this Term was as strange and as unknown as the Name to 'em: If he means the *Name*, we agree to it: But the Name is nothing to the purpose. If he means the *Thing*, 'tis an easie matter to set him right, by shewing him in these last Words, *One Lord Jesus Christ*, an Attribution perfectly like that which we find in these, *To us there is but one God*, &c.

Further, (says the same Author) if the Term *God* is taken in this place as being peculiar to the Father, either it includes a particular Excellency, and is taken for the Person which is the Source of the other; or 'tis taken for the Father, without denoting any particular Excellency. If the former be said, we have shew'd in the preceding Chapter, that those who thus speak, either contradict themselves, and acknowledge in effect that the Father alone is the Supreme God; or else they say nothing at all. And if the latter, (that this Name apply'd to the Father denotes no manner of Excellency that is peculiar to him) it follows, that the Apostle must have spoke nothing to the purpose. For the Question was not, whether the Father was but One, but whether God is but One, as appears from the Words preceding, &c.

We will return Crellius his own Words. If the Term *Lord* is taken in this Place as being peculiar to the Son, either it includes a particular Excellency, and is taken for the Person which has a primitive Authority; or 'tis taken for the Lord, without denoting any particular Excellency. If the former be said, we shall shew, that those who thus speak, either contradict themselves, and acknowledge in effect that the Son is the Supreme Lord, or else they say nothing at all. And if the latter, it follows that
the

the Apostle must have spoke nothing to the purpose. For the Question was not, whether the Son was but One, but whether the Lord is but One, as appears from the Words preceding. Let our Adversaries answer this Objection first.

As for our part, we are not concern'd to answer it. For what is this Objection else but mere Nonsense? The Term *God* does not, by its being appropriated to the Father, evertheless retain its natural Signification, and signifie that Infinite Excellency or Eminency of Perfection which disttinguish this Essence from all those who were called Gods or Lords upon Earth or in Heaven. The Father, who is disttiguisht not from the Son, or from the Holy Ghost, for this was not the Question; but from false Gods, from Magistrates, and from Angels, is consider'd as more perfect than whatever had been call'd God. And what mighty Difficulty is there in all this? Is not Jesus Christ likewise disttiguisht in this place, not from the Father, for that was not the Question; but from those that were call'd Lords upon Earth or in Heaven?

Crellius is afterwards embarast in *Metaphysical* Reasonings, which 'tis needless to refute, and indeed difficult to translate into our Language. Let us therefore proceed to something more important.

C H A P. VI.

Wherein their Objections are further Answered.

OUR Adversaries take one of their strongest Objections out of the first Chapter of the Gospel according to St. *Luke*, wherein the Sacred Historian informs us, that the Angel which appears to *Mary*, foretels that Holy Virgin, that she shall bring forth a Son who shall be form'd by the Power of the Holy Ghost, and for this Reason shall be called the Son of the Highest : From whence it seems as if one might conclude, that the Title of Son of God, which Jesus Christ bare, and which distinguish'd him in so glorious a manner from other Men, is founded only upon the Conception of the Holy Ghost. It will be proper to recite the Evangelists Words at large. *Then said the Angel unto her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy Womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his Name Jesus. He shall be Great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the Throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever; and of his Kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the Angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man? And the Angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.*

These

These last Words have given occasion to the Objection. It is demanded, how the Evangelist could say, that Jesus Christ should be called the Son of God, because he should be formed by the Power of the Holy Ghost, if it be true that he is the Son of God from all Eternity. We have already answer'd this plausible Objection several ways; but perhaps have not yet given all those Explications that are necessary to solve it fully. We shall therefore reduce what we have to say to six principal Answers.

First, We shall observe, that in this Revelation, as in all others, God's Design is to suit himself to the Capacity of the Person to whom he manifests his Counsel. When God reveal'd himself to *Moses*, he accommodated himself, in some measure, to that Prophet's Prejudice, who imagin'd that God had Parts like the Parts of a Humane Body, and could not obtain to see his Face. The reason why God reveal'd to the Prophets the Calling of the *Gentiles* under the Ideas of the Law, by saying sometimes, that there should be an Altar rais'd in the midst of *Egypt*, and sometimes that from the rising of the Sun to the going down thereof, Sacrifices of Peace-offering, and pure Oblations should be offered to God, is, because the Prophets had their Minds full of these Ideas, and therefore things to come must have been propounded to 'em under such Images as they were well acquainted withal.

'Tis plain, that the Angel which appears to *Mary* does the same thing on this occasion. He might, if he had pleas'd, have spoken of Jesus Christ as the Mediator that was to reconcile Heaven and Earth. At least he might have represented him to his Blessed Mother, to whom he foretold his Birth by Anticipation, as an Universal Monarch who should reign over every Nation;

Nation, Tribe and Language, (according to the Oracle of the Prophet *Daniel*) and as a Spiritual King that should reign over the Hearts and Consciences, and as the Lord of the Universe, to whom should be given all Power in Heaven and in Earth. Which yet he does not do, because these Objects are not proportionable enough to the Prejudices of that Holy Virgin, who is to be lead by degrees into the full and perfect Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven: But he speaks to her of the re-establishment of *David's* Kingdom, which was at that time the Object of the Nation's Hope, and most familiar to the Mind and Heart of the *Israelites*. *The Lord God, says the Angel, shall give unto him the Throne of his Father David, and he shall reign over the House of Jacob, &c.*

And if so, we should not be too much surpriz'd, that the Angel gave not upon this Occasion the Idea of the Eternal Generation, and that he chose rather to begin with the Elements of Religion, and to propose the Nativity of the Messiah under known and familiar Ideas, than immediately to lead her Mind, to whom he addresses himself, to the most sublime and most incomprehensible point in Religion.

There are some who answer, *Secondly*, That Jesus Christ may be considered either as come forth from God in Time, or as come forth from God in Eternity. They likewise distinguish Two Divine Generations of Jesus Christ; the One whereby God makes him to be the Brightness of his Essential Glory, in communicating to him his Glory and infinite Perfections; and the Other whereby his Flesh was form'd of a refin'd and sanctify'd Matter by the Operation of the Holy Ghost. They pretend, that indeed Jesus Christ is from God from all Eternity by this Generation,

tion, in regard of which he comes from his Father, as the Light comes from the Sun : and by this Generation they pretend that Jesus Christ was from the Beginning, that he was with God, that he was God, that he was in the Form of God, thinking it no Robbery to be Equal with God, being in the Bosom of his Father before all Ages, He by whom all Things were made, Things Visible and Invisible, the Almighty *Word* which upholds all things, the Son of God who had before the Foundation of the World, a Glory wherewith Jesus Christ ask'd to be glorify'd in the Fulness of Time. But 'tis also maintain'd, that Jesus Christ, consider'd as Man, came forth from God, in that he was form'd without the Aid of any Man by the Power of the Holy Ghost. Now if we join this Answer with the foregoing, it might be granted that Jesus Christ is call'd the Son of God, by the Angel, precisely because he was to be conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost. But it must be added, that his Design is not to reveal to Mary the Eternal Generation, as being an incomprehensible Mystery, the knowlege whereof is reserv'd for such as have been already instructed in all the Principles of the Christian Religion.

The *Third* Answer refers these words, *Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*, not only to what immediately precedes, viz. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee*, but to all that precedes in general, and also to these Words of Mary : *How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man ?* so that the Sence of this Passage is this : If thou wert to bring forth a mere Man, thou must do it by ordinary means, and must know a Man : but that which shall be born of thee shall be Holy,

ly, and is to be call'd the Son of God, the Son of the Highest. Wherefore it will be necessary that the Holy Ghost should come upon thee, and that the Power of the Highest should over-shadow thee.

It may be said, in the *Fourth* place, that the Scripture frequently makes use of such Expressions to signifie the Event of Things, as seem to signifie the Cause of 'em : as when the Evangelist says, *Therefore they could not believe, because that another Prophecy said agen.* Thus the Expression, on which the Difficulty and Objection is rais'd, seems to denote the Cause for which Jesus Christ should be call'd the Son of God ; viz. because he should be form'd by the Power of the Holy Ghost : but it denotes no more than the Event. So that the Sence of those Words amounts to this : *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee ; the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee, and it shall come to pass that That Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be call'd the Son of God.*

To all which may be added, in the *Fifth* place, that Jesus Christ is called the Power and the Wisdom of God, consider'd in the first Estate wherein we said that he is God, or in the Form of God ; and that thus we might understand of Jesus Christ who is the Eternal Word, these Words of the Evangelist, *the Power of the Highest shall over-shadow thee* : which would utterly remove the Difficulty.

But admit, *Sixthly*, that the Angel's Expression were taken in the utmost rigour of the literal Sence, yet we pretend that this makes nothing against Us. For 'tis true, that the Power of the Holy Ghost which purify'd the Body of Jesus Christ in his Conception, has procur'd to Jesus Christ, as Man, the Glorious and Inestimable

Advantage of being call'd the Son of God. This Principle is true, in what Sence soever you take this Expression, *he shall be call'd*, whether you take it for, *he shall be*, or whether it signifies, *he shall be call'd*. 'Tis certain, that the Conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost has procur'd to that which was born of *Mary*, to be the Son of God. For as the Humane Nature of Jesus Christ is hypostatically united to the Divine Nature, only because this Humane Nature is form'd of a refin'd and sanctify'd Matter by the Holy Ghost: so also it is true, that it partakes of the Glorious Titles of *Son of God*, of *the Brightness of the Glory of God*, only in consequence and by vertue of his Miraculous Conception. The same Principle has procur'd him the Honour of being call'd the Son of God. For that which makes the Humane Nature of Jesus Christ to be sometimes honour'd in Scripture, (tho' improperly) with the Glorious Titles and Qualities, which belong only to the Eternal Son of God or the uncreated Word, is only the Union of this Nature with the Word. So that as this Union of the Humane Nature form'd in time with the Word which is Eternal, depends essentially and principally on the Operation of the Holy Ghost, which united the Corporal Nature with the Eternal Nature by sanctifying the Former, it follows, that we have just ground to refer to this Power and Operation of the Holy Ghost, as its true Principle, the Name of *Son of God*, which shall be given to that which shall be born of *Mary*.

In truth, tho' there were some difficulty in this Passage, which the Wisdom of God had left to exercise our Faith withal; yet 'tis very certain that our Adversaries could gain no manner of Advantage by it; because 'tis easily prov'd to 'em, that the Title of Son of God in Jesus Christ

Christ is necessarily establisht upon other Foundations besides that of his Conception.

In effect, 'tis proper to observe, that Jesus Christ does not only bear the Title of Son of God, but he is also commonly call'd the Only Son of God, or the Only Issue of the Father, his Beloved Son, his Own Son, &c. and consequently we are not to inquire into the reason of the general Title of Son, but of the Title of Son by way of Excellence.

Our Adversaries, who do all they can to forbear acknowledging the Eternal Generation of Jesus Christ, establish the Title which he bears of Only Son, upon Five Foundations, which are, I. His Conception by the Holy Ghost. II. His Investiture in the Offices of Prophet, Priest and King, whereby he holds the Place of God. III. His Unction, consisting of the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Ghost, which he receiv'd in a most extraordinary measure. IV. His Resurrection from the Dead, whereby *he was declared the Son of God with power by the Resurrection from the Dead.* V. His Exaltation after his Sufferings, whereby he was exalted above all Powers, and inherited a Name which is above every Name.

As to the *First*, it is certain that the advantage of having been conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost, (to go no further) is not greater than the being form'd immediately by the Power of God, and the being form'd in a State of Innocence and Holiness, as were the Angels and the Souls of other Men; or, to make use of such Examples as are uncontested, as were the Souls of our first Parents. For to be form'd by the Spirit of God, or by the Power of God, is much the same. Further, whatever is form'd by the Power of God, is form'd by his Spirit: *All things having been form'd, according to the Psalmist,*

by the Spirit of his Mouth. And indeed the Spirit is explain'd in the Text of the Evangelist by Power. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of God shall over-shadow thee, &c.* This is certain, and chiefly according to our Adversaries Hypothesis. And if so, Jesus Christ might well be call'd the Son of God, because he was form'd by his Power and Spirit: But yet this Title would be common to him with other Intelligences, and especially the Angels, whom God created by his own immediate Power. Jesus Christ would then be the Son, but not the only Son. Perhaps, 'twill be reply'd, that Jesus Christ must have call'd himself the Son of God upon this account in a particular Sense distinguish'd from the Angels, because it does not belong to the Angels to have a Father, they being Created and Unbegotten Intelligences; which may be likewise said of the Souls of our first Parents, and of all the Souls of Men without exception; whereas Jesus Christ being a Man like to other Men, and being to have a Mother, and to be conceiv'd in the Womb of a Woman, it did belong to him to have a Father: So that having not had one as other Men, but the defect of this ordinary cause of Generation having been supply'd by the Holy Ghost, we are not to wonder either that he is called Son of God, or that he is so call'd exclusively of pure Intelligences.

This Reply is vain, for two Reasons. First, because the Quality of Son, of Own Son, of Only Son of God, which is so great and august a Title, becomes vain, and of no value or dignity, if we give it no farther Consideration than what our Adversaries give it. For from their Principle it follows, that the reason why Jesus Christ is the only Son of God exclusively

of the first Man, or of Angels, is because the latter having been produc'd and form'd immediately, were not form'd in the Womb of a Woman, as was Jesus Christ, to whom it is proper and peculiar. But, I pray, what Dignity or Excellence is added to a Creature form'd immediately of God, by having been form'd in the Womb of a Woman, or without the help of a Woman? That which strengthens and confirms us in this thought, is, because the Holy Scripture makes us to look upon the Title of the Son, and only Son of God, as an eminent and glorious Title whereby Jesus Christ is distinguished from all the Angels. But it would be extravagant to imagine, that the Eminency of this Glory consisted in this Circumstance, *viz.* that Jesus Christ having this common with the Celestial Spirits, the having been form'd immediately of God, he was form'd in the Womb of a Woman. The *Second Reason* why we cannot satisfy our selves with such an Answer is, because there is something nobler and more perfect in being created and form'd immediately of God, without any help of either Father or Mother, than in being form'd without a Father in the Womb of a Mother by the Power of God. Certain it is, that the less Second Causes intervene in the Production of a Divine Work, the more immediate Relations it has unto God; and 'tis true, that *immediate* Production is in its way more Excellent than *mediate* Production: As the Creation of Man, for instance, was more perfect than his Generation. If therefore Jesus Christ deserv'd to be called the Son of God, for this reason purely, because he was form'd by the Power of God together with the intervention of a Mother, but without the help of any Father; it follows, that *Adam*, who

was form'd without Father and without Mother by the Hands of God, though his Body was taken out of the Slime of the Earth, will deserve a much honourabler Title; and that the Angels, who were form'd in a more perfect manner than *Adam*, because not form'd of any pre-existent Matter, will be worthy of a more Glorious Title than he.

Here perhaps I shall be told, that the Conception of the Holy Ghost is not the only Foundation on which is establisht the Title of only Son of God. But if so, this gives occasion, first, to seek for other Reasons of this Name which the Scripture gives Jesus Christ. And then, our Adversaries must disclaim the advantage they pretend to get from these Words of the Evangelist, *Therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*. For if they pretend that the Evangelist notes in this place the only Foundation upon which is establisht the Title of Son of God, they contradict themselves: And if they will have this Expression to have other Foundations, it has then no more force to exclude others, nor consequently to oppose the Eternal Generation. But since 'tis necessary to assign other Foundations of this Glorious Title; let us proceed to examine those which are observ'd by our Adversaries.

The *Second* Foundation they observe, is the Investiture of Jesus Christ in several Offices. For this purpose they quote these Words of Jesus Christ in the Gospel according to St. *John*. *It is written, I said, Ye are Gods. If then those are called Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? We have*
al.

already explain'd this Passage elsewhere, and have shew'd, that Jesus Christ does not mean to answer their Words, but their Necessities and Dispositions. However, we may very well say, that Kings, Princes or Judges have been call'd in Scripture by the Name of Gods : But we never read that they were call'd the Sons of God, and especially in the frequent, ordinary and familiar use of this Term. Further, if Jesus Christ were the Son of God, only or chiefly by reason of his Offices ; it follows, that he must have been much more the Son of God from the time he began to preach, than he was before : Which can be said upon no account whatever. Add to this, that when Jesus Christ receiv'd this Testimony from Heaven after his Baptism, *This is my belov'd Son in whom I am well pleased*, these Words do not signifie that Jesus Christ began to be his Son that very moment. In fine, it may be said, that if Jesus Christ is the Son of God by reason of his Trusts or Offices, he must be so either by Nature, or by Adoption, or by a Metaphor, because we have not as yet found out any other way. It cannot be said, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God by Nature in respect of his Offices : this implies a contradiction ; and 'tis needless to attempt to refute it. Neither will it be said that Jesus Christ is the Son of God by Adoption in respect of his Trusts. For how can the Quality of Prophet, Priest or King be the formal Cause of Jesus Christ's Adoption by God ? Further, we, are all the Children of God by Adoption : and if Jesus Christ were Son only by Adoption, he would not be distinguish'd from Believers. Lastly, if it be said, that Jesus Christ is Son of God by a Metaphor in respect of his Offices, that is to say, that in respect of his Offices

fices Jesus Christ looks upon himself as the Heir and Son of God, though he be not his Heir by Right, nor his Son but in a Figurative Sense, you fall into a greater perplexity still. For, first, you make Jesus Christ to be the Son of God in a less noble and excellent manner than that wherein Believers are : Who are God's Sons by Adoption, and consequently in a more particular manner than by a Figure or Metaphor. Further, to say that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, because God uses him as he would use his own Son, if he could have one, is to go directly against the Scripture ; 'tis, besides, to weaken infinitely the Ideas which we have of the Glorious Quality of only Son of God ; as well as tacitely to acknowledge that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God properly and truly.

The *Third* Foundation upon which they establish the Title of Son of God ; is that Divine and Supernatural Unction which Jesus Christ receiv'd from his Father, and by which he was capable of fulfilling so worthily the most difficult Functions of his Ministry, and which consists in the Gifts of the Holy Ghost which were communicated to him without measure. But, first, it is certain that they here confound the Effect with its Cause, the Character with the Thing characteriz'd. 'Tis true, that God gave his Spirit to Jesus Christ as Man ; but he gave it him without measure, because he was already his Son. And therefore this Unction does not establish him, but suppose him Son of God. I also own, that the Gifts of the Holy Ghost are the Character of God's Children : *For to as many as he hath made his Children, hath he given the Spirit of Adoption, which cryeth in their Hearts, Abba, Father.* But as God giveth us not his Spirit

Spirit till after he hath adopted us, and hath given us this Privilege to be called his Children: So may we suppose, that if Jesus Christ was filled with the Holy Ghost, 'tis because he was the Son of God, and consequently this Fulness of Gifts and Graces supposes him, and does not make him, to be the Son of God. Add to this, that if Jesus Christ were honour'd with the Name of Son of God, only by reason of the Gifts he receiv'd, he might indeed be called the Son of God, but not his only Son; because though he did receive the Holy Ghost in a most extraordinary Measure, yet he is not the only one that receiv'd it. In a word, it is certain that Jesus Christ was the Son of God before his Inauguration and Baptism, and consequently before this extraordinary Unction.

The *Fourth* Foundation upon which they establish the Glory of this Title, is his Resurrection from the Dead. Upon which they quote these Words in the 13th Chapter of the *Acts*. *And we declare unto you glad Tidings, how that the Promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus, as it is also written, in the Second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* By this Expression, *raised up*, some understand the Resurrection from the Dead: And, I confess, the Original may bear both these Versions. Neither do I deny but that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is spoken of both in the preceding and subsequent Verses: But this does not hinder but that we may understand this Expression, *in that he hath raised up*, of Jesus Christ's coming into the World, or of his Establishment on the Throne of *David*. For 'tis this that is principally meant in this place. In the preceding Verses
the

the Apostle spake of the Promise God had made to the Fathers : *Of the Seed of David hath God, according to his Promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.* He afterwards gives an account of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ; and then he returns to this Promise which had been made to the Fathers concerning the sending of Jesus Christ, which he does when he adds these Words : *And we also declare unto you, that as to the Promise which was made unto the Fathers, God fulfilled it unto us who are their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus, &c.* God had made a Promise to the Fathers, which was to raise unto Israel a Saviour : There was the Promise. God raised up Jesus Christ, sent him, brought him into the World to save us. Here was the Accomplishment of the Promise. But what shall we do with these Words which the Apostle adds? *As it is written in the 2d Psalm, This Day have I begotten thee.* We will say, that this Typical Declaration is quoted as a Testimony of God's Design to accomplish the general Promise he had made to this People of sending them a Saviour or Deliverer.

When all is done, 'tis extravagant to say, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God principally, because he was rais'd up again from the Dead; since he was God's only Son, God's own Son, his Son by way of Excellency, even before his Resurrection : which appears both from the manner wherein he speaks of himself, and from the manner wherein others speak of him. *I came forth, saith he, from the Father, and am come into the World : Again, I leave the World, and go to the Father. Philip, He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father : And how say'st thou then, shew us the Father ? No one, saith the Evangelist, hath seen God at any time. He that is in the Bosom of the Father, he hath declared him,*

him, or made him known. Further, when the Apostles say, that he was declared the Son of God by the Resurrection from the Dead, they do thereby acknowledge, that he was the Son of God before his Resurrection. Add to this, that if Jesus Christ were called the Son of God properly and truly, because he was raised up again from the Dead, he might be called his Son, but not his only Son, in that he was not raised up alone. In fine, if Jesus Christ is called the Son of God by reason of his Resurrection, 'tis certain he cannot be so but by a kind of Metaphor and Analogy, and very near in the same Sense that Intelligences created by God are called the Sons of God. For we cannot see how a Man's Resurrection is more properly and truly a Generation, than his Creation. But there is no body but would be offended to hear, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God only by a Metaphor, and in a Sense purely figurative. Indeed, if this were true, we should have an Advantage over him, in that we are the Sons of God by Adoption; and a Man is more properly a Son by Adoption, than he can be by a bare and naked Metaphor.

Lastly, The *Last* Cause from whence they derive this Title of Son, and of Only Son of God, is the Sovereign Exaltation of Jesus Christ after his Death and blessed Resurrection. We shall not stay long to refute this Speculation, because all the Reasons we have alledg'd above return upon this Head. In effect, was not Jesus Christ God's Son, his own Son, and his only Son before his Exaltation? Further, shall we never distinguish between his being Son, and his entring upon the actual Possession of his Inheritance? I grant, that Jesus Christ entred upon the full and actual Possession of the Inhe-

Inheritance, that was prepar'd for him, by his Ascension into Heaven : But does it follow that he was not the only Son of God before ?

In short, it may be said in the general, that God hath *anointed* his Son, that he hath *sent* his Son, to be our King, our Prophet, and our High-Priest ; That he hath *raised up* his Son, and that he hath *highly exalted* his Son : And by Consequence we ought to think, that instead of saying that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, only because he was Spiritually anointed, and was invested in his Offices, and was raised up again, and was highly exalted after his Resurrection ; 'tis rather necessary to acknowledge, that Jesus Christ was anointed above his Fellows, was invested in the Office of Mediator, and his other Trusts, whereof another could not acquit himself ; was the First-Fruits of them which sleep, and was exalted after his Resurrection, only because he was already before all these things the Son of God. And if so, either he must look upon his Conception by the Holy Ghost, as the only Foundation on which is establisht the Title of Son of God ; which we have demonstrated to be extravagant : Or we must have recourse to a more ancient Generation than This is.

But here, as well as throughout this whole Subject, we must nicely distinguish the *Manner* of the Mystery from the *Mystery it self*. The Mystery it self is certain, but the Manner of the Mystery is incomprehensible. I shall not attempt to explain the Eternal Generation of the Son of God. I acknowledge it to be above all our Thoughts, and all the Images that we could possibly make use of ; and that we must not wonder if we find Defects in all the Comparisons that the Wit of Man can use upon this Subject : But to satisfy my Reason and my Conscience, I have

have no need of those Comparisons. For if I do not agree to this One general Principle, that there are some most incomprehensible Truths, which are nevertheless most certain, I am not capable of reasoning either in Nature or Religion. And if I do agree to it; the Incomprehensibility of the Generation of Jesus Christ is no longer a Reason for me to doubt of it. I ought only to examine whether it be possible for me to call in question the Truth of this Mystery which is so clearly revealed to me in the Scripture.

Now in this Examination, I am convinc'd of the Truth of these Three Principles. First, That Jesus Christ was before his Conception and Birth. This we have fully prov'd in the preceding Sections. Secondly, That Jesus Christ was in that first Estate which preceded his Manifestation in the Flesh; that he was, I say, the Son of God; for in this the Scripture is express. *I came, says Jesus Christ, I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World: And again, I leave the World, and go to my Father.* Here you see, that before his coming into the World, he supposes himself as come forth from his Father. *God sent his Son.* You see that he is the Son of God before he is sent. *We have, say the Disciples, we have beheld his Glory, a Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.* And that you may'nt be troubled to know what Glory is meant here, Jesus Christ asks this Glory of his Father himself, when he says to him, *Glorifie thy Son with the Glory which he had with thee before the World was.* You see then that in Quality of Son of God, or of only Begotten of God, Jesus Christ had a Glory with his Father before the World was: And who doubts but that 'tis on this same account that Jesus Christ

Christ is called the *Brightness of his Fathers Glory*, he that upholds all things by the *Word of his Power*, who was in the form of God, who was *God in the Beginning*, a God that manifested himself in the *Flesh*? and consequently that Jesus Christ before his Conception is not only the Son, the Son of God, but also a *Glorious Son* who partakes of his Infinite Perfections. The *Third Principle* is, that as Jesus Christ is the very same of whom the Scripture teacheth us, both that his *Goings forth are from Everlasting*, and that he is the *Everlasting Father*, and that his *Years fail not*, and that he has neither *Beginning of Days*, nor *End of Life*, and that he is with his Father before the *Foundation of the World*, and that he is God, one with his Father, equal with his Father, and partaking of the same Glory with his Father, we cannot without Extravagance refer his Existence and Original, I mean, that Existence which he possesses before he comes into the World: We cannot, I say, refer it to any Temporal Generation; and consequently, how incomprehensible soever the *Manner* of the Mystery is, yet the Mystery it self is certain and uncontestable.

C H A P. VII.

Wherein their Objections are further Answered.

OUR Adversaries make great account of all those Passages of Scripture which shew that Jesus Christ is depending on his Father. Hereupon they are very eager to quote us those places of Scripture which say, that Jesus Christ does nothing of himself, or that he does only those Works which the Father gave him to do; that the Son knoweth not the Hour of the last Judgment, that the Father is Greater than he; and that he is to deliver up the Kingdom to his Father at the end of the World.

They make of each of these Passages a particular Argument against us, of which their Books are full. But they must not take it amiss if we put them altogether, and if, as they make but one and the same Difficulty in the main, we likewise give them but one single Reply. We shall say but very little upon this occasion, but what we do say shall be clear and demonstrative.

First then, we meet with such Passages in Scripture as are directly and diametrically opposite to These, at least in Appearance. For we there find, that Jesus Christ acts by his own Will. *Be it done unto thee according as thou hast believ'd. I will, be thou Clean.* It is said of him, that *he thought it no robbery to be equal with his Father.* St. Peter says, that *he knoweth all things.* And, lastly, the Scripture teacheth us, that *of his Kingdom there shall be no End.*

These two sorts of Passages appear contradictory: but yet they are not: because they come from the Spirit of Truth, who is not a

D d

Spirit

Spirit of Contradiction and Imposture. From whence it plainly follows, that of two Hypothesis, that which makes these Passages to clash, must be necessarily false, and that which on the contrary makes them agree, is preferable to the other.

But I maintain, that the *Socinian* Hypothesis makes these Passages to clash, and that *our* Hypothesis reconciles and unites them : and consequently I have good reason to conclude from hence, that our Hypothesis is preferable to the *Socinian* Hypothesis. This therefore must be prov'd.

How then will the *Socinians* shew me that Jesus Christ is equal with his Father, and inferiour to his Father ? Jesus Christ, according to them, is inferior to the Father by Nature : Is he then equal with him by his Offices ? By no means. This would be a Contradiction. The Offices of Jesus Christ make him the Minister of God : He is not therefore equal with God by his Offices ; and instead of saying upon this account, that *he thought it no robbery to be equal with God*, we must say, that the Pretension of a Minister would be accounted Insolence, if he call'd himself equal with the Master he serves.

How will they shew me that Jesus Christ knows all things, and yet don't know the Hour of the Judgment ? The Distinction of Nature and Office is of no use here. For when this Knowledge is in question, 'tis plain, that something belonging to his Nature is in question. Will they say, that when St. Peter says to Jesus Christ, that he knows all things, he does not speak in the general ? But what is speaking in the general, if not the making use of a general Expression ? Further, it appears that from a general Principle he draws a particular Consequence. *Thou knowest*

knowest all Things, saith he, *thou knowest that I love thee*: Which naturally signifies, *Thou knowest that I love thee*, for that thou art not ignorant of any thing. To say that St. Peter was mistaken, when he said so, has no manner of pretence; because he could not be mistaken, without uttering Blasphemy upon Jesus Christ's account, by attributing to him an Infinite Knowledge which belongs only to God; and because Jesus Christ would never have rewarded Blasphemy with saying to him, *Feed my Sheep*.

How will our Adversaries reconcile those Passages which shew that Jesus Christ does nothing of himself, and those Instances which they so frequently alledge to us of Jesus Christ's Praying to his Father at *Lazarus's* Grave, and saying, that the Father never fails to hear him, with those other Passages which shew that his Will commandeth and worketh Miracles? For if Jesus Christ is but a mere Man, who only begs of God to do these miraculous Works, what Confidence is it to say, *I will, be thou made clean*? Had *Moses* said so, he would certainly have been very Insolent. The Apostles also express themselves in a very different manner. Of what use then can the Distinction of Nature and Office be on this occasion?

Lastly, we do not see that their Hypothesis is e're the happier, when they are to reconcile what the Scripture says of the Eternity of Jesus Christ's Kingdom with what it says of the end of this Kingdom, when it gives us to understand, that Jesus Christ is to deliver up the Kingdom to God his Father. For as, according to them, Jesus Christ does not reign by Nature, but in respect of his Offices which are to have an end; we do not see how this Kingdom can be Eternal; or, to make use of a more

forcible Expression which removes the Equivocation, now there is to be no end of this Kingdom.

Our Adversaries therefore are not able to reconcile these Passages. But what will they say, if we reconcile them perfectly? Will they not own that our Hypothesis has a visible Advantage over theirs?

For this purpose their Distinction of Nature and Office, which is Fundamental in their Hypothesis, is of no manner of Service. But our Distinction of two distinct Natures in Jesus Christ, which is essential to our Sentiment, will have a much better Success.

Indeed nothing can be easier than to reconcile Scripture with Scripture according to this Distinction. Jesus Christ is Man: and therefore he is inferiour to the Father. Jesus Christ is God: and therefore he is equal with the Father. Jesus Christ is Man: and therefore is ignorant of some Things. Jesus Christ is God: and therefore he knoweth all things. Jesus Christ is Man: and therefore he acts in dependance upon the first Cause, he prayeth, and is heard. Jesus Christ is God: to act therefore he need only to will, and by willing he commands, and by commanding he executes: *I will, be thou made clean.* Jesus Christ is Man: and therefore he may receive a Dominion and Power which before he had not, and may also receive it for a certain time, after which the Oeconomy of Mediator, in regard whereof he received it, ending, this Dominion endeth likewise. Jesus Christ is God, and in this respect he hath an essential and necessary Dominion, which shall never have an end, no not when the acquir'd and Oeconomical Dominion shall cease, and shall have changed its Nature and Object.

Here

Here *Crellius* will reply, that this Distinction of two Natures is a Distinction which we have only imagin'd. First, how can we have imagin'd it, since we cannot reconcile Scripture with Scripture without it; and when our Adversaries in rejecting it, put themselves under an impossibility of delivering themselves from these appearing Contradictions?

Besides, we need only consult the Scripture, and there we shall find the Foundation of this Distinction. For when it speaks to us of a *God manifested in the Flesh*, it gives us to understand the Divine Nature, manifested in the Humane Nature, as has been already prov'd elsewhere. Now what is a Divine Nature manifested in a Humane Nature, but the Distinction of Jesus Christ's two Natures, which is the Foundation of our Doctrine, and by which we explain all these appearing Contradictions of Scripture.

If you examine all these Passages more narrowly, you will see that the Distinction of the two Natures does very well agree with the Scope of 'em. *If ye loved me*, says Jesus Christ in *St. John*, Chap. 14. ver. 23. *if ye loved me, ye would certainly rejoice, because I said to you, I go unto the Father. For my Father is greater than I.* We plainly see, that 'tis as Man that Jesus Christ goeth away; for in other respects, he is to stay with his Disciples to the end of the World. 'Tis of Jesus Christ, considered as going away speedily, and by consequence of Jesus Christ as Man, that 'tis said, *the Father is Greater than I.*

As to this Dependency which they observe in these Expressions, *He came forth from the Father: The Father hath given to the Son to have Life in himself: The Father sheweth the Son the Works which he doth himself: The Son can do nothing*

but what he seeth the Father do: The Son speaketh not of himself: These are explain'd in the most natural manner in the World, both by the Distinction of the two Natures, and by the Relation of Mediator, and by that Subordination which is between the Father and the Son in their manner of Subsistence, except it be in their Essence, as most certainly it is not. But the Scripture being so wary upon the manner how this is done, 'twould be rashness in us to carry our Enquiries any higher, and we again declare we will make none that are Curious and Philosophical. Divinity consists in speaking with the Scripture, and in going no farther.

C H A P. VIII.

Wherein we endeavour to satisfie our selves about the Difficulties of this Great Mystery.

HAVING now answer'd the Principal Difficulties our Adversaries can object against us, and they borrow from the Scripture, 'twill be proper to inquire how we may satisfie our selves about the Obscurities we meet with, in the Principle we have Establish'd.

For this purpose we must *first* consider, that every thing, whether in Nature or Religion, is full of Difficulties. If you consider the Heavens, you will be astonisht at their Greatness, and will not be able to comprehend that Infinity, which is necessarily found at the End of those vast Spaces that encompass us. If you cast your Eyes on the Earth, you will meet with

with as many Myſteries of Nature, as there are Plants and Animals, and even Creatures inanimate. You will meet with inſuperable Difficulties in explaining the Vegetation of the One, the Senſation of the Other, and the Motion of the Third. If you behold the Sea, 'twill aſtoniſh you with the Wonders of its Flux and Re-flux. And to conſider Nature in General, you will not comprehend either the Infinity in Greatneſs, or the Infinity in Smalneſs. And if you add to the Conſideration of Bodies, that of their Duration, Time will ſhew you incomprehenſible Wonders, whether in that unbounded Succeſſion already elaps'd, or in that which is to come. Next to Bodies follow Spirits, in which every thing ſurpaſſes us. We do not comprehend either their manner of Exiſting, or their manner of Acting, and our Own Soul is ſo great a Paradox to it ſelf, that it hath long ſince deſpair'd not only of comprehending, but even of knowing it ſelf.

And if ſo, is there any reaſon to pretend, as do our Adverſaries, that there is not One Object in Religion, but what we perfectly comprehend, and that 'tis impoſſible to aſſent to the Doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, which is ſo clearly reveal'd in God's Word, on pretence either that it contains ſuch Difficulties in it, about which our Reaſon cannot eaſily ſatiſſie it ſelf, or that we draw ſuch Concluſions from this Myſtery as create trouble to our Underſtanding.

The Unreaſonableneſs of our Adverſaries is ſo much the greater in this, that the Difficulties of Religion, eſpecially thoſe that we meet with in the Doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ought to be much greater than thoſe we meet with in Nature, for two Reaſons: *Fiſt*, be-

cause the Objects of Nature being in themselves Created and Finite, have also of necessity more proportion with a Mind as Ours is, than the Objects of Religion, and especially the Divinity of the Lord Jesus, which is an Object infinite in Glory and Perfection. *Secondly*, because God has not prepar'd us for those great Difficulties which we meet with in Nature; whereas he has so well prepar'd us for those in Religion, that he has frequently given us to understand that his Word would appear to us a sort of Foolishness.

Yes, will they say, but Man's Reason is his principal Light, and in some measure the principal Revelation whereby God makes himself known to him. 'Tis by Reason that we are guided to the Scriptures: and 'tis Reason alone that delivers us from the Blindness of *Pyr- rhonism*. All this is true; Reason prepares the way to Faith, as has been already observ'd elsewhere; but Reason is silent, when it has once found the Scriptures; neither is any thing more reasonable than the renouncing our Reason, which may be mistaken, and indeed is very frequently mistaken, to hearken to the Voice of a Divine and Infallible Authority. But this will be farther illustrated by our Second Consideration.

It must be therefore added, in the *Second* place, that there are *Two* Kinds of *Knowledge*, which may be had of things; the *First* we may call, a Knowledge of Curiosity; and the *Second*, a Knowledge of Practice: and this Distinction takes place in all Arts and Sciences without any Exception. Thus in the Art of Navigation, we must know what a Ship is, what Seas are safest and most dangerous, at what time the Sea is Navigable, and at what time it is not. This belongs

longs essentially to the End of Navigation. A Man cannot be without this Knowledge, without exposing himself to very great Dangers. And this kind of Knowledge, I call a Knowledge of Practice : but it may be inquir'd after this, why the Sea is Salt ; what's the reason that such and such a Sea has its Flux and Reflux more than another ; and why such and such Winds reign more in this Climate than they do in that which is opposite to it. And this kind of Knowledge, we call a Knowledge of Curiosity, and we pretend that 'twould be very extravagant to fail of reducing the other into practice, upon pretence that these contain such Difficulties in 'em, as our Minds can never solve.

'Tis the same with all Natural Knowledge. I resolve, for instance, upon Eating, and sometimes when I have no Appetite, from the Knowledge I have that by this alone I must recruit my Strength ; and I do not defer taking my necessary Food, 'till I have comprehended the manner how this Food is turn'd into Chile, this Chile into Blood, this Blood into Flesh, &c.

Let us proceed now and say, that in Matters of Morality and Divinity there are Two kinds of Knowledge, the one of Practice, and the other of Curiosity. Thus to worship Jesus Christ, I must know that he is God. To put my Trust in him, I am to look upon him as God : But it is not necessary I should know the *Manner*, and the Mysterious and Adorable Secrets of the Hypostatical Union. As to what is *Practical*, it is this ; that Jesus Christ is God over all blessed for ever ; He that made Heaven and Earth, the Word that upholds all things, the Son of God whom all Creatures ought to worship. And that which belongs to Man's *Curiosity*, is, the entering upon abstracted and speculative Inquiries

quiries in this respect, upon which the Minds of the School-men are ever wandring.

• Observe, *Thirdly*, that God's Design in his Revelation, whether natural, or written, is to make known to us the Mystery, and in no wise the *manner* of the Mystery. In the Revelation of Nature God discovers himself to our Minds under the Idea of an Almighty God that created Heaven and Earth; but he does not answer an infinite number of curious Questions which the Mind of Man devises, and has in all Ages devis'd about the *manner* how God's Power acts. He does not tell you, whether the Quality of Creatour be an Accident inherent in God, or whether it be only an external Relation. He does not determine whether God can do such things as imply a Contradiction, &c. This same Revelation of Nature gives us those Ideas of the Divine Wisdom and Providence, that are every way capable of obliging us to put our Trust in it. But it does not solve an innumerable number of Difficulties, which arise from our not being able to comprehend the *manner* how the Divine Wisdom concurs in Bad Actions by the Direction of Evil it self, which God makes subservient to Good Ends. 'Tis the same with Written Revelation, in which God teacheth us the Mystery of the Incarnation. Nothing can be plainer than these words, *God Manifested in the Flesh*, when they are consider'd in the relation they have to so many other Passages of Scripture which explain or confirm to us the Truths they contain, and in Relation to the Analogy of Faith: but they do not answer an almost infinite number of Humane Difficulties, which may be rais'd about the *manner* of the Mystery; and it may also be said, that this is neither necessary nor possible. It is not possible: because

as

as the Mind of Man is infinite in the Doubts it does or may conceive, the Volume of Scripture must also be infinite, to be able to answer all Objections without any exception. And it is not necessary: because the knowlege of the *manner* of the Mystery, could only serve to indulge or flatter our Curiosity; whereas the knowlege of the Mystery it self serves for Practice; and 'tis Practice, and not the Satisfying our Curiosity, that the Holy Ghost has principally in view. It were to be wisht that those who take upon 'em to teach Divinity, where of this mind, and did make a due Separation in the Matters they treat, of what is Necessary, from what is not. They would be surpriz'd to find by this Discussion, that the greatest part of Mankind frequently spend their whole Life in collecting a Knowlege, that is of much less vlaue than Ignorance. They would plainly see that these Philosophical Divines lose their way the very first Step they think to make in the Search after the Truths of Salvation, because they spend their time and pains in attempting to comprehend what is Incomprehensible, instead of insisting purely upon what is True.

But here we must add a *Fourth* Reflexion, which is very considerable: *viz.* that the Ignorance of things in Religion has its uses, as well as the Knowledge of 'em. It was necessary that the Prophets and Patriarchs should not understand the Mystery of the Incarnation so particularly as we do. For, 'tis certain, that this Knowledge would have hinder'd the most necessary Effects of the Law, and such as were most in the Plan of the Divine Wisdom. For if the antient *Israelites* had represented God to themselves as becoming Man in order to save them, how would they have trembled at the Idea

Idea of God, as the Severe and Fearful Judge of the Actions of Mankind? Certainly the distinct View of what was to pass upon Mount *Sion* might have rendered them insensible as to the sight upon Mount *Sinai*; and they would never have cry'd out, *We shall certainly dye, for we have seen the Lord*, if they had represented to themselves God himself not only shewing himself to the Eyes of Men in the Lustre of his High and Full Majesty, but also manifesting himself in an infirm and miserable Flesh. Here, perhaps, I shall be told, that God might very well have dispenc'd with giving a rigorous Law, and might have say'd Men at that time, as he saves them now, by an Oeconomy full of Grace and Love. And I own he might: But without being so bold as to search too deeply into God's Ways, and to inquire whether he might make use of this Mean rather than another, it is sufficient to know that God has been pleas'd to prepare the way to his Mercy by an Oeconomy of Rigour and Vengeance, which made Sin be sensibly felt, and his Salvation heartily desir'd: It is, I say, sufficient to know, that God has been pleas'd to make use of this Mean in the Plan which his Eternal Wisdom had rais'd of the Salvation of Mankind, to be able to reason upon this Order as an Order that was to be establisht. And this gives us reason to think, that as the Ideas and Sentiments of this most rigorous Oeconomy, and this Spirit of Servitude considered in its whole Extent and Dominion, do not agree with the clear and distinct Notions of the Incarnation, which is the most agreeable and fit Object to inspire Confidence that ever was, it follows, that the Ignorance of this Mystery had its uses under

nity, nor Spirit distinct from Body, nor Angels, nor Deity ; because 'tis impossible to have any other Knowledge of these things, which we neither do nor can see, than an Abstracted and Metaphysical Knowledge ; and it is to pretend that we ought never to examine the Common and General Attributes of things : which cannot be done without a Kind of Metaphysics. But if it be granted that there may be a good, solid and true kind of Metaphysics, we must see whether we ought not to give this Name to the Metaphysics in question.

I answer, Secondly, that I meet with Two sorts of Metaphysics in the Mystery of the Incarnation : for I find there the Metaphysics of the School-men, and those of the Apostles. As for the First, I heartily resign them to our Adversaries, and I own that the Speculation of the Schools have introduc'd abundance of Obscurity into the Subjects of Divinity in General, and into this Mystery in Particular. But if we insist upon the Metaphysics of the Apostles, I ask, whence these Metaphysics came at such a Time as that was, before all the School-men, and this Inundation of Humane Speculations ? Who put them into the Heads of a few poor and mean Fisher-men, whose Education had taught them no such thing ? For, in short, it is not we, but they who have reveal'd to us the Grand Mystery of *Godliness, God Manifested in the Flesh*. It is not we, but they, who make Jesus Christ *the Creator of the Worlds, the Word that upholdeth all things, the First and the Last, He by whom and for whom all things are, who is One with his Father, God's Son, God's Own Son, Come forth from his Father before he came into the World, God, the Most High God, God over all Blessed for evermore*. These are the Metaphysics of the Apostles ; and these are

E e

Ours.

Ours. We desire no Other. And God forbid we should ever attempt to express our selves either more clearly, or more forcibly, or more nobly.

We do not blame the Pious *Subtlety* of those who seek after divers Emblems to represent to themselves a Mystery which is undeniably above all Images and Expressions: but it must be granted, that this sort of Parallels do not ordinarily succeed, and that for Three Reasons. First, because these Parallels speak only to our Imagination. Now it is not the Imagination, but Reason, that must be here principally satisfy'd. For as the divers Emblems under which I may represent to my self the Divine Nature, have but little force to convince me of its Existence: so the divers Images under which may be represented to me the Mystery before us, will have but little force to convince me of its Truth. Secondly, because these Parallels give our Adversaries occasion to examine the Disparities and Defects of the Comparison, which cannot but be very numerous thro' the necessary disproportion which ought to be between Images taken from Creatures, and an infinite Object: from whence it comes to pass that the Enemies of the Truth build upon these Disparities of imaginary Triumphs, and afterwards make use of 'em to blind the Simple, and seduce the Ignorant, who don't very well comprehend the Design of these Parallels, which was not to convince the Mind, but to assist the Imagination, or, at farthest, to shew that these Things are not so abstracted as 'tis impossible to discover some sensible Touches of 'em in the most ordinary Objects of our Understanding. Lastly, the Third Reason why these Parallels appear to us not so advantageous, is indeed because they seem

guments, cannot be answer'd but by overthrowing the Scripture.

The *Second* important Reflexion to be made is this, that the *Socinian* Glosses being the most probable Explications that the Wit of Man can give to controverted Passages, when it would weaken the Arguments we take from them in behalf of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus, as must be honestly granted, yet at the same time they come so unnaturally into the Mind, that one must either guess at them, or else have read 'em before in the Writings of those who took so much pains to invent 'em, to be able to light on 'em. So that as we are not obliged to have a Spirit of Divination, or to decipher unsearchable Riddles; so neither are we under an Obligation, not only to approve, but even to know these refin'd Subtleties, which weaken the Ideas the Scripture gives us of the Glory and Divinity of the Lord Jesus. This is what we have shew'd at large.

The *former* of these Reflexions proves the Truth of our Principles, and the latter shews the Safety of 'em. The one satisfies our Mind, and the other our Conscience. And the one and the other join'd together, will give us a just Idea of this Treatise, which I dedicate to the Glory of my Saviour. *Forgive, O God, my Imperfections and Infirmities, and do thou thy self establish, by thy Holy Spirit, the Sacred and Eternal Truths of thy Gospel, that as thou hast been pleas'd to manifest thy self in the Flesh, so all Flesh may acknowledge thy Glory. AMEN.*

ERRATA

Occasion'd by the Translator's Absence from the Press.

PAGE 27 Line ult. for *and* read *are*. p. 30 l. 12 dele *the*.
 p. 31 l. 4 after *have* add *a*. *ibid* l. 30 after *say* add
so. p. 33 l. 21 for *perished* r. *persisted*, p. 34 l. 11 for *ex-*
gulfion r. *explication*. p. 36 l. 18. for *time* r. *true*. p. 37 l.
 15 for *then* r. *when*. p. 48 l. 17 after *not* add *as*. p. 49
 l. 34 after *imagin'd* add *it*. p. 51 l. 3 for *detain'd* r. *de-*
clar'd, p. 68 l. 21 r. *mere*. p. 76 l. 2 for *never* r. *ever*, and
 after *so* add *little*. p. 97 l. 34 after *it* add *(.)* p. 153 l. 11
 for *shoots* r. *shocks*. p. 245 l. 32 after *Philip* add *He*. p. 257
 l. 2 for *Oracles* r. *Oracles*, p. 270 for אלהים r. אלהים.
 p. 274 l. 7 for *worshipt* he r. *worship* the, p. 321 l. 33. for
Inconveniency r. *Inconvenienciés*. p. 345 l. 20. for *exclusively*
 r. *exclusively*. p. 367 l. 32 for εὐσεβείας r. εὐσεβείας. p. 377
 l. 7 for *Cardace* r. *Candace*. p. 379 l. 32 for *permeious* r.
precious. p. 398 l. 21. for *he* r. *we*.

fsi

he

dd

ex-

yl

49

de-

nd

il

57

N:

for

ely

77

ri